

reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 820) thereon.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SMITH of Maryland:

A bill (S. 6638) to pay the claim of the American Towing & Lightering Co. for damages to its tug *Buccaneer* (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LANE (for Mr. CHAMBERLAIN):

A bill (S. 6639) for the relief of Jonathan J. Totten (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

PRESIDENTIAL APPROVAL.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. Latta, Executive clerk, announced that the President had, on October 13, 1914, approved and signed the following joint resolution:

S. J. Res. 193. Joint resolution to authorize the President to grant leave of absence to two commissioned officers of the line of the Navy for the purpose of accepting an appointment under the Government of Brazil as instructors in naval strategy and tactics in the Naval War College of Brazil.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED.

H. J. Res. 362. Joint resolution to correct an error in the enrollment of certain Indians enumerated in Senate Document No. 478, Sixty-third Congress, second session, enacted into law in the Indian appropriation act approved August 1, 1914, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

RECESS.

Mr. KERN. I move that the Senate take a recess until 11 o'clock to-morrow forenoon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m., Wednesday, October 14, 1914) the Senate took a recess until to-morrow, Thursday, October 15, 1914, at 11 o'clock a. m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, October 14, 1914.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Hasten the day, O God, our heavenly Father, when Thy children shall live together in peace and harmony. In the world's broad fields of endeavor there is room enough and plenty for all, but for the selfishness, greed, ambitions, and unholy desires of men. Quicken the good that is in us, that as individuals and as a nation we may live what we profess to believe, practice what we preach, doing unto others as we would have them do unto us, that we may be an example to all the world in righteousness and in good government. That Thy kingdom may come and Thy will be done, in His name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I move that the Journal be approved.

The motion was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. MOSS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Indiana rise?

Mr. MOSS of Indiana. I wish to ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD a speech made by Representative MORRISON, of Indiana, before the convention that nominated him for Congress.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MOSS] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by printing a speech made by his colleague [Mr. MORRISON] to the convention which nominated him. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, on yesterday evening the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLET] asked unanimous consent to extend his remarks by incorporating a speech delivered by Representative WINSLOW, and, also, Representative PLATT, of New York, asked unanimous consent to extend his remarks on the subject of the Grand Army, to which objection was made. If these two requests be coupled with the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MOSS], I will have no objection to it.

Mr. MANN. Do not couple them together.

Mr. STAFFORD. I assume there will not be any objection to their requests.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MOSS]? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. GILLET. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by publishing a speech delivered by Representative WINSLOW at the Republican State convention in Massachusetts.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks by printing a speech made by his colleague [Mr. WINSLOW] at the Republican State convention in Massachusetts. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of Representative PLATT, I ask unanimous consent that he be given the privilege of printing his remarks in the RECORD on the subject indicated last night, namely, the Grand Army.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. PLATT] be permitted to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject of pensions. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Wyoming rise?

Mr. MONDELL. To ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on sundry political subjects.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wyoming asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD on sundry political subjects. Is there objection?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Reserving the right to object, does not the gentleman think two to one is sufficient for one day?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yesterday it was three to one—three on that side and two on this.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. But not political speeches.

Mr. STAFFORD. They were political speeches, too.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I have no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FALCONER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD extracts from a speech made by Mr. Roosevelt at the great Progressive convention at Bay City, Mich., recently.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by printing a speech made by Col. Roosevelt at Bay City, Mich. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS.

The SPEAKER. Under the special rule the House will resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 18459, and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR] will take the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 18459, of which the Clerk will report the title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 18459) to declare the purpose of the people of the United States as to the future political status of the people of the Philippine Islands and to provide a more autonomous government for those islands.

With the pending amendment.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to suggest that there is a little error here that I think the chairman of the committee will agree to correct, and I move to strike out the last word in order to make the suggestion. On page 22, lines 21 and 22, it is provided:

That no franchise or right shall be granted to any corporation except under the conditions that it shall be subject to amendment—

And so forth. Now, I propose to strike out those words, "to any corporation," or else add "to any person or corporation." Any franchise granted to John Jones or Bill Smith would not, if he assigned it to a corporation, come under this provision. It says that any franchise granted to any corporation shall be subject to amendment, alteration, or repeal.

Mr. JONES. What line?

Mr. BRYAN. Line 22, page 22, "No franchise or right shall be granted to any corporation except under the conditions," and so forth. Now, I suggest that we strike out those words "to any corporation" and make the provision apply to any franchise that is granted. It amounts to a "joker" as it is—unintentional, of course—but it is a "joker" whose bones ought to be cracked.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Washington yield to the gentleman from Iowa?

Mr. BRYAN. Yes.

Mr. TOWNER. I suggest that the language usually used, and that which would probably be necessary, would probably be "individual, firm, or corporation."

Mr. BRYAN. That would be all right. But the word "person" would, I understand, cover corporations under our statute, but "corporation" is restrictive. If you strike out the words "to any corporation," there will be no question left, and I suggest that the chairman either revise the language that I have suggested or else strike out those words.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, of course we can only return to this section by unanimous consent. I think it might be well enough to make this change, and I therefore ask unanimous consent to return to this section; so that I may offer to amend, in line 22, after the word "any," by adding the words "individual, firm, or."

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would ask the gentleman from Virginia the number of the section.

Mr. JONES. Section 26.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. JONES] asks unanimous consent to return to section 26 for the purpose of offering an amendment. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 22, line 22, after the word "any," by inserting the words "individual, firm, or."

Mr. STAFFORD. No; the word "person."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman what is a right granted to a person where you reserve the right also to take away the lands or use and occupation of the lands? Is it designed not to permit the Philippine Legislature, under a general or special law, to grant any rights to persons over lands in the Philippine Islands?

Mr. JONES. I believe, Mr. Chairman, the words "franchises and rights" are somewhat synonymous as here used. They are the words employed in the organic law. I think the word "right" is simply used to broaden the meaning and purpose of this provision.

Mr. MANN. Of course, if it has been settled by any construction that the word "right" really means "franchise," very well. I understood, when we passed the original legislation, that it was designed to curb the authority of the Philippine Commission to grant land to corporations, but it was not designed to prevent them from granting the right of land to individuals. Now, if you insert in every patent of land that is granted a provision that land may be taken away from the individual, it looks to me as though you were destroying the value of the grant.

Mr. JONES. I think the gentleman is confusing this section, which applies entirely to franchises, with those sections which relate to the disposition of land. As has been suggested to me by a gentleman sitting near me, Mr. GARRETT, the word "right" might be used in connection with the exercise of the right of eminent domain, whereas the word "franchise" would not be applicable in that connection. This language has been in the present law for 12 years. I do not know how often it has been construed, but I do know it has been the law for 12 years, and the committee thought, inasmuch as there has been no complaint in respect to it, that it would be best to reenact it in its present form.

Mr. MANN. This proposition is to change it from its present form. It now restricts the right to make a grant to a corporation, and then it goes on and says "rights of use and occupation of lands thus granted shall revert to the governments by which they were respectively granted," and so forth. It plainly covers, or plainly could be held to cover, the granting of lands for other purposes. If, however, the gentleman is satisfied with it, I shall not object.

Mr. JONES. There has never been any criticism of this section, so far as I know, and we were content to keep the language of the present law. I ask for a vote on the amendment, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. JONES].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I think when we rose last evening there was an amendment pending which I had offered to section 27. I had moved to strike out the figures "\$18,000," in line 20, and insert in lieu thereof the figures "\$25,000." I

was assured that that would be opposed, but that the chairman of the committee was willing to accept an amendment to this effect: "not less than \$18,000, the amount to be fixed by the Philippine Legislature." I am perfectly willing to accept that.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, what the gentleman says is true, but since I indicated that I would not object to his amendment I have conferred with other members of the committee, and we think that no minimum should be fixed unless there is also a maximum limit. If the gentleman cares to offer an amendment substituting \$20,000 for \$18,000, I shall not oppose its adoption.

Mr. MILLER. Is it not the disposition of the committee to accede to the wishes of the Filipinos, expressed as they have been many times, especially through their Resident Commissioner and the speaker of their assembly?

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I think that the sentiment which was voiced by Commissioner QUEZON is due to the fact of Gov. Gen. Harrison's exceptional popularity. The Filipinos would like, I am aware, to increase his salary. But I do not think that that fact, however, ought to be taken into consideration in fixing the salary for this position. I really think that in view of the impoverished condition of the islands and the fact that the government is retrenching expenses in every direction, we ought not to increase the salary above what it originally was.

Mr. MILLER. I believe it was \$20,500.

Mr. JONES. It was \$20,500. I suggest that the gentleman modify his amendment by making it "\$20,000," and there will not be any objection on this side.

Mr. MILLER. I readily appreciate the fact that the force of numbers is on that side, and they can vote it down. But I would like to have a vote to decide the question whether or not the committee is willing to accede to the wishes of the Filipinos, expressed as clearly as they can be expressed. I do not concede the position that the gentleman takes now, that the only reason why the Filipinos have ever suggested an increase in the salary of the Governor General is that they like Gov. Gen. Harrison. If that is the situation, they are the most shortsighted and the most nearsighted people imaginable, possessing not at all the qualifications for self-government claimed time out of mind for them by the gentleman from Virginia. Surely they see farther than the noses on their faces. Surely when they speak of the salary of the Governor General it means the salary of all Governors General, and not merely this one.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Mr. GORDON. Since when have you become so deferential to the wishes of the people over there?

Mr. MILLER. I have always been.

Mr. GORDON. Then, why do you not vote for their independence?

Mr. MILLER. Will you vote for their independence now?

Mr. GORDON. I will, and you will vote against it.

Mr. MILLER. This bill is as far from giving independence to the Philippine people as the gentleman is far from knowing what the wishes of the people are.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I hope we will not take up any more of the time of the committee in the discussion of questions that have already been thrashed over. I do not understand that the Philippine people have expressed a desire to have this proposed increase of salary. The representative from the Philippine Islands did say that he believed his people would like to see it increased, but I know of no action that has been taken by the people in the Philippine Islands relating to the subject.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from the Philippine Islands, as I recall, interrupted me for the purpose of explicitly stating that it was the desire of the Filipino people that the Governor General should receive a salary of \$25,000. He substantiated that and emphasized it by stating that he had received a letter or a cablegram from Señor Osména, speaker of the Philippine Assembly, in which he said that the salary of the Governor General should be \$25,000. I will say, in addition, that men I have talked with on the subject of salaries in the islands, no matter how they may have differed in other matters, all agreed that the salary of the Governor General should be \$25,000.

Mr. JONES. The gentleman knows that the assembly over which Señor Osména presides voted last winter to reduce this salary.

Mr. MILLER. I understand full well that they did that at the personal request of Gov. Gen. Harrison, and he is not to be blamed for the attitude he then took. They desired to reduce many salaries in the islands, some which I think should properly have been reduced, and he saw at once that it would not be consistent for him to urge or recommend the reduction of other salaries unless his own were cut. So he voluntarily requested that his own salary be cut nearly \$3,000, and the gentleman

knows that the salary does not cut much figure with a man like Gov. Gen. Harrison.

Mr. JONES. The gentleman can offer his amendment for \$25,000, but I hope he will modify it so as to make it \$20,000. I will not object to making the amount \$20,000.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment:

Strike out the figures "\$18,000," in line 20, page 24, and after the word "General" insert the following: "not less than \$18,000, the amount to be fixed by the Philippine Legislature."

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BRYAN. My amendment pending which was to be taken up to-day as a new section comes in before section 27. Will the consideration of this amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota interfere with the new section 26a?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will say that following this section the amendment referred to by the gentleman from Washington will be taken up.

Mr. BRYAN. But the gentleman from Minnesota is offering an amendment to section 27, and my new section is 26a.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I want to say a word about the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MOORE. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MOORE. Did I understand the Chair to say that we would go back to some other section of the bill after the consideration of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. We so agreed yesterday afternoon.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will say that was agreed to before the adjournment last night.

Mr. MOORE. That does not cut off offering further amendments to section 27.

The CHAIRMAN. We are considering section 27 now, which the Chair understands is subject to amendment.

Mr. MOORE. I desire to say that I have some amendments to section 27.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. If the gentleman will glance at the RECORD of yesterday afternoon, he will see that the agreement was that we should pass over the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington and read section 27, and after the completion of that we should return to the consideration of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. MOORE. That agreement was not made to the exclusion of other amendments to section 27.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Certainly not.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I want to say a word about the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER]. His amendment provides that there shall be a minimum amount fixed in this statute for the salary to be appropriated for the Governor General by the Philippine Legislature. Now, the only reason, as I understand, that we throw any restrictions about the Philippine Legislature is that the restrictions may operate in favor of the Filipino people. If we make any restriction as to the amount of the salary, it ought to be a maximum amount above which they could not take from the treasury to pay an American sent over there to act as Governor General. If we fix a minimum amount, that leaves it open for them to give \$100,000 a year. There ought to be a maximum with it, of course. I am opposed to the amendment.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute for the amendment of the gentleman from Minnesota, that after the words "Governor General," line 20, page 24, insert the words "not more than \$15,000, the amount to be fixed by the Philippine Legislature."

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I find that on yesterday afternoon I offered an amendment to increase the salary from \$18,000 to \$25,000, and I ask unanimous consent to withdraw that amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment he speaks of. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend the amendment of the gentleman from Minnesota by substituting \$15,000 for \$18,000.

Mr. BORLAND. No; change the wording. The amendment is to insert \$15,000 and change the wording, the amount to be fixed by the Philippine Legislature.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend by inserting "not more than \$15,000, the amount to be fixed by the Philippine Legislature."

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER] is unquestionably right. If there is any utility in fixing the salary in the organic law, it is to fix a maximum above which the legislative body or those having control of the treasury can not go. The idea of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER] in fixing a minimum below which they can not go is clearly in the interest of the officeholder; who in this case happens to be not a citizen of the islands.

Mr. MILLER. The minimum in the amendment is not my own opinion. I inserted that at the request of gentlemen on the other side as representing their views last evening, before we adjourned. I myself would prefer to leave it entirely to the Philippine Legislature, without fixing the maximum or the minimum.

Mr. BORLAND. I am discussing the unwisdom, from my point of view, of putting in a minimum amount.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, if I may be permitted a moment, I would like to add a word to what the gentleman from Minnesota has said. That suggestion was made from this side on yesterday evening, but I distinctly said to the gentleman a few moments ago that after further considering the matter we were not willing to accept it.

Mr. MILLER. And I distinctly made that statement, that I am representing the views of that side, last evening.

Mr. JONES. The gentleman can not now say, however, that his amendment represents the views of the majority of the committee, because it does not.

Mr. MILLER. I do not. I do not know how much the gentleman has changed since last evening.

Mr. JONES. I distinctly informed the gentleman that we had changed our minds in regard to his amendment.

Mr. MILLER. I so understand it, and have so stated at least three times.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to know who has the floor?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] has the floor.

Mr. TOWNER. Then, will the gentleman yield to me for a moment?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes.

Mr. TOWNER. I want to say to the gentleman from Missouri that in my judgment his amendment will result in making it impossible for the President to ever send anybody there except a millionaire as Governor General. What we ought to do is to be very careful that we may give a sufficient sum so that men may be chosen upon their merits and not because of the size of their pocketbooks.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit one more interruption there?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes.

Mr. COOPER. In connection with what the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER] has said, it is interesting to recall that when Gov. Gen. Taft returned from the Philippine Islands he said to a committee of the House that the salary he was receiving made it utterly impossible for him to do justice to the position over there and save one dollar. I think the salary then was—

Mr. GORDON. Twenty thousand five hundred dollars in gold.

Mr. COOPER. Yes. He said that his statement sounded as though he had been indulging in extravagance, but he insisted that it was absolutely necessary under the conditions which obtain in the Philippine Islands to have that salary. In my judgment \$18,000 is as low as we should now go.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I have no desire to force my individual views upon any of the gentlemen further than to present this matter to the calm judgment of the House. There may be special reasons why in the Philippine Islands a man has to spend a large amount of money to maintain the dignity of the office of Governor General. I have heard that claim urged in regard to a great many different positions—that of foreign ambassadors, that of the governors of the different States, and other positions of that kind—that the incidental expenses required a man to draw upon his private purse, and that the salary was inadequate. We are utterly unable to determine that. It is a question of taste and of temperament, as much as anything else, so far as I can discover. We do send great men to the foreign courts of Europe on salaries infinitely less than we are fixing for this Governor General. We do have 48 great States governing themselves, some of them containing a population equal to that of the Philippine Islands, and the governor in not one of them has any such salary, to my knowl-

edge, and in many of them the governor draws less than a third of the salary mentioned here.

I do not assume that it is possible in all cases where a man who takes an office of dignity and prominence to have enough salary furnished him to keep up the dignity of that office. I assume that there is, in a case like that of the Philippine Islands, some sort of civil list out of which the necessary expenses for the dignity of the position may be obtained outside of the personal purse of the man who occupies the office. If it is not so, it ought to be so. I see the gentleman from Minnesota shakes his head, but it ought to be so in every case where a man occupies a regal or vice-regal position. Where he is the official head of the Government, there is a civil list which aids him in carrying out those necessary duties; but I think if we make this salary \$25,000 it will make it one of the greatest political plums in the United States, if not in the known civilized world. I never heard of such a position being thrown into the political arena to be scrambled for as a \$25,000 Government job.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BORLAND. In a moment I will yield to the gentleman from Ohio. No man in this House has a higher respect for the magnificent ability of the present Governor General of the Philippine Islands than I. I served with him in this House, and I came to recognize his great intellectual ability, his great moral courage, his splendid tact, all of his likable and attractive qualities, and his inflexible integrity in the discharge of public duties. He is a man, in my judgment, who is vastly beyond the qualifications necessary for the position. I think he has ample—and to spare—of qualifications for the position, and I cherish for him, in addition, a high personal regard and a sincere personal affection. Nothing that I say in regard to salary could be influenced pro or con by my personal feeling toward the gentleman who now occupies the position. If it were a question of personal friendship, I would be glad to vote for any amount for that man; but it is not a question of personal friendship.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BORLAND. In just a moment. It is not a question of personal friendship; it is a question, among other things, of teaching these people self-control, self-restraint, self-sacrifice necessary to build up a form of government among themselves, and I do not see how we can start out with a list of \$25,000 salaries for appointive men. I now yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Fess].

Mr. FESS. The Governor of Porto Rico gets \$8,000 a year. What is the difference between the duties in the Philippines and the duties there that will require such an additional salary?

Mr. BORLAND. Among other things the population of the Philippines is at least eight times that of the population of Porto Rico. It is a distant point from home, and the responsibility of the man who is on the ground is very much greater.

Mr. FESS. But would that require eight times the salary?

Mr. BORLAND. I think the salary of the Governor of Porto Rico of \$8,000 is ample, and yet I know it would probably take all of that for a man to maintain the dignity of the position.

Mr. COOPER. Will the gentleman permit an interruption?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes.

Mr. COOPER. I would like to say in reply to the question of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Fess] that there is a vast difference between Porto Rico and the Philippines. Porto Rico is a parallelogram of about 40 by 90 miles, whereas the Philippines—

Mr. BORLAND. I am sorry I can not yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin for that. I yield now to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT].

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I fear that the remarks of the gentleman touching the personality of the Governor General of the Philippines will leave an impression that the present Governor General of the Philippines was in some way interested in this increase of salary.

Mr. BORLAND. I should be sorry to leave that impression. From my knowledge of things I am confident that no suggestion emanated from him in regard to such increase—

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. As a matter of fact—

Mr. BORLAND. I would assume that to be true, and I am confident that it is true.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. We ought to be specially careful in criticizing, and as a matter of fact the Governor General of the Philippine Islands suggested the necessity that the salary, which had been heretofore \$20,500 a year, should be reduced, and it was reduced to \$18,000 per annum; that is, the 10 per cent in common with the others.

Mr. BORLAND. Well, that is exactly in line with my judgment of the present Governor General, and I would assume he would take that ground, without knowledge on the subject.

Mr. SLAYDEN. If the gentleman will permit, I would like to ask the gentleman from Tennessee if the recommendation of the Governor General is to be taken, as his mature judgment, as to the amount we are required to appropriate for the administration.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. As to that I can not say.

Mr. SLAYDEN. I presume from his recommendation it must have been.

Mr. JONES. It applied, I will say, to all of their officers, 10 per cent reduction.

Mr. BORLAND. I am sorry, without asking that my time be extended, that I can not yield again. I simply want to say this, that we have got to show those people, among other things, an example of public service that may not be adequately compensated for or free government will not exist among them. Free government does not succeed unless public service is performed beyond the monetary consideration involved. And I say we are setting a wrong example to start out with a \$20,000 or \$25,000 appointive position and setting a new legislature at work upon that basis of salary. They will assume that as a barometer by which other salaries are to be gauged and you may be sure they will say, "This is the American scale; this is what Americans feel ought to be paid," and they will assume that that is our judgment as to conditions there in the Philippine Islands. We ought to set in this law a maximum in the interests of the taxpayers of the Philippine Islands as is set in all organic laws, or ought to be, beyond which the tax-disbursing power can not spend the people's money. Then we ought to make that limit fairly low. [Applause.]

Mr. HELM. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the amendment. The statements of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] voice my sentiments in this matter. I do not mean by that that I shall vote for his amendment, because I shall stand by the provisions on this subject in the bill, but his ideas are sound, and if there has been any test, a real test of the sentiment of the Philippine Legislature under existing conditions, it was when, upon the recommendation of the Governor General himself, the Philippine Legislature reduced the salary of the Governor General from \$20,500 to \$18,000. What better test can you have than that? The cablegram of the speaker of the Philippine Legislature must yield in weight and importance to the action of the entire body. Now, from what has been said here on the floor, this committee must have learned by now, especially from the statements made by my good and much admired and appreciated friend, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER], who very recently visited the islands, in almost every declaration that he has made on the floor he has constantly referred to wild men in the islands. His oft-repeated statements would lead a person to think that the only kind of people there are wild men. He has spoken every time he has arisen in his place on the floor of wild men, wild men, wild men. Wild men do not pay taxes—

Mr. MILLER. Oh, yes, they do; every one of them.

Mr. HELM. Wild men. I take it, do not own or accumulate property of any kind. They are neither captains nor malefactors of great wealth.

Mr. MILLER. Every one of them pays the cedula tax and is on the roll.

Mr. HELM. Doubtless the gentleman from Minnesota saw the wild man from Borneo. [Laughter.] The gentleman would convey the idea that it is necessary to lasso those men to get within speaking distance of them; but be that as it may, we do know, and the gentleman had informed us, that thousands and thousands of natives of the Philippine Islands wear nothing and own nothing but G strings. Do these men wear these things as a matter of style? Is it a matter of taste—

Mr. MILLER. Of taste and preference, most of them.

Mr. HELM. Or have they abundant means of buying such clothes as the gentleman from Minnesota adorns himself with—

Mr. MILLER. Oh, no.

Mr. HELM. (continuing). And other people like to adorn themselves with, or are they reduced to the necessity of the simple, plain, and unadorned G string? Mindful of conditions in Ireland and India it becomes us to make the burden as light as possible. The gentleman from Minnesota and other

gentlemen want to impose the magnificent salary of \$25,000, raised in part by taxing these poor classes, upon a man to look after the welfare of that type of people. I say that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] has presented the proper gauge and standard. The duty of this Congress is to teach lessons of frugality. [Cries of "Oh!" on the Republican side.] Yes; it is a very natural thing for the Republicans to sneer at a proposition of frugality. [Laughter.] If there has been one characteristic sin of the Republican Party it has been waste, more waste, and extravagance. That is your long suit, and a Democrat who rises upon the floor of this House and voices any other expression may expect to reap nothing but sneers and jeers at the hands of the Republicans. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I want to say only one word in reply to the suggestion made by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS], and it was rather a pointed suggestion, that inasmuch as we give only \$8,000 to the Governor of Porto Rico there is no occasion for the \$18,000 or \$20,000 as salary of the Governor General of the Philippines. Now, I am in favor of economy as much as is the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] or the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS]. However, there is no similarity between conditions in Porto Rico and conditions in the Philippines. Porto Rico is about as wide as from here to Baltimore—about 40 miles—and a little more than twice as long. In other words, it is a parallelogram of about 40 by 90 miles. Its population is homogeneous. There are no wild tribes. It is one island, and the Governor can travel all over it in one day; but in the Philippines the Governor General, in order to do his duty, must travel for weeks over many islands. An air line from the northern end of Luzon south to the southern end of the lowest of the large islands would measure more than 600 miles, and to go from island to island and go by boat, as he must of necessity do, and then to travel over the islands and visit their inhabitants, would make a journey of thousands of miles and necessitate a great deal of expenditure that would not be necessary in Porto Rico. In other respects the situation in Porto Rico and that in the Philippines differ widely. The people in the Philippines are not homogeneous. They speak several different dialects. There are wild tribes which have to be visited. The great markets of oriental trade are close at hand. The whole situation is different from that in Porto Rico, and of necessity the Governor General of the Philippines is entitled to a larger salary than is the Governor of Porto Rico.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER], because I do not think the Governor General's salary should be as high as \$25,000.

Mr. MILLER. I do not offer it as \$25,000. I leave that to the legislature.

Mr. JONES. Not less than \$25,000.

Mr. MILLER. Not less than \$18,000, leaving the exact amount to be determined by the legislature.

Mr. JONES. I am opposed to the amendment, because it would permit the legislature to fix the Governor General's salary at \$25,000, or even a larger sum. I am opposed to the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND], because I think that the sum of \$15,000 is too small a salary for the Governor General of the Philippines.

I would like to give the House some information which I do not think it possesses. The salary of the Governor General was until recently \$20,500. It became necessary last winter to cut down the expenses of the Philippine Government in order to avert an impending deficit, but Gov. Gen. Harrison would not consent to any reduction of salaries which did not include his own. The assembly, I may say to the gentleman from Minnesota, was opposed to the reduction of the salary of the Governor General. The Filipinos did not wish his salary reduced; but Gov. Gen. Harrison was not willing, as I have said, that other salaries should be reduced and his left where it was—a commendable position for him to take, I think. So the law which was passed provided that the salaries of all of the higher officials should be reduced to the extent of 10 per cent. The salary now is not just \$18,000; but it is 10 per cent less than the \$20,500 heretofore paid.

There are nine members of the Philippine Commission. One of them is the Governor General. Four of the others hold portfolios. They are the heads of the great departments, and each of those heads of departments had been drawing a salary of \$15,000 up to last winter, when it was reduced by 10 per cent.

Mr. QUEZON. Fifteen thousand five hundred dollars.

Mr. JONES. Fifteen thousand five hundred dollars. It was reduced to the extent of 10 per cent, as all other of the higher salaries, except those of the judiciary and one or two other

classes, were. If the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Missouri should be adopted, then the salary of the Governor General would be little more than the salary that the heads of the departments are receiving. This bill does not undertake to fix those salaries. They are to be continued as they are under this bill until changed by the legislature provided for in the bill.

Mr. BORLAND. Will the gentleman permit?

Mr. JONES. Just one minute, and then I will answer the gentleman's question, if I can.

There is a vast difference, as I happen to know, between the expense necessary to maintain the position of the Governor General and that to maintain the position of a head of a department. The Governor General has to do a great deal of entertaining. He lives in an immense old Spanish palace. He has to have a large retinue of servants, a number of carriages and automobiles, and he is obliged to live in a much more lavish manner than any other official. I am quite sure that the Governor General spends more than \$25,000 a year. I know that Gov. Gen. Taft out of \$20,500 did not save anything, and that he was as poor a man when he came from the Philippines as he was when he went there. I do not think, therefore, that the salary ought to be reduced to the amount that the gentleman from Missouri suggests, but I do believe it would not be amiss to fix it at \$20,000. I therefore suggested to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER] that if he would move to amend by making it "\$20,000" there would be no objection to his amendment so far as I am concerned.

Now I will answer the question of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND].

Mr. BORLAND. A few minutes ago the chairman was speaking about the salary of these other members of the commission, being executive heads of bureaus, but not having the duty of entertaining which falls upon the governor. Now, I notice in this bill that the chief justice of the supreme court gets \$10,500. Would not that be a pretty fair and adequate salary for the head of the department of education, for example, or the head of the department of internal works? Is not \$15,500 a pretty high salary for a member of the Philippine Commission? Could they not be well reduced in comparison with the salary of the governor?

Mr. JONES. This bill does not undertake to fix those salaries at all.

Mr. BORLAND. But it does fix the salary of the chief justice.

Mr. JONES. Yes; it does fix the salary of the chief justice, and I will tell the gentleman the reason.

Mr. BORLAND. I am not concerned in the reason, but I am speaking of the amount.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BORLAND. I am calling the gentleman's attention to the fact that you have fixed the salary of the chief justice, who, we all agree, is a very important officer in the islands. Now, is not the salary fixed for him adequate in every way for a commissioner of education? Is it necessary that a commissioner of education shall have \$15,500?

Mr. JONES. I will answer that question. Mr. Chairman, the only officials in the Philippine Islands who are appointed by the President of the United States are the Governor General and the members of the supreme court. The committee thought it was proper to fix the salaries of the appointees of the President so that they could not for any reason be changed by the legislature. We thought that these officials should be entirely independent of the legislature. The salaries of all other officials, including those of the four heads of departments, are to remain as at present until changed by the legislature. Whether they are too large or too small, I can not say, but they have been fixed at \$15,500. That is the heads of departments, mark you. The heads of departments are members of the Philippine Commission and therefore members of the upper branch of the legislature, and they receive a salary as members of the upper branch of the legislature and also receive a salary as heads of those departments. The two together aggregate \$15,500.

Now, that is a pretty good salary, I admit, and I rather agree with the gentleman that it is too large. But it is the present salary, and the legislature can decrease it. This bill does not undertake to say what salary shall be paid to officials who are not appointed by the President of the United States.

As to the salaries of the members of the supreme court, I do not think they are too low. I will say to the gentleman that, while I have no information on the subject, it is believed by some Filipinos that they are too high and it has been suggested to the committee that they ought to be reduced.

I wish to say to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Fess], who referred to the salary of the Governor of Porto Rico as being \$8,000, that whilst that is true there is a bill pending in this House, which has the unanimous support of the Committee on Insular Affairs, which proposes to increase the salary of that official to \$10,000. The committee unanimously agreed that the present salary was too small.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. JONES. I will.

Mr. MILLER. Is it not a fact that in this bill the old commission, as we understand it, has been discontinued, and therefore those salaries that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] speaks of as at \$15,500 will disappear with them?

Mr. JONES. That is true. The legislature will then fix the salaries of the four heads of departments.

Mr. MILLER. There will be really new duties—what you might call new offices—and a corresponding readjustment of salaries?

Mr. JONES. That is true.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I sincerely hope that the amendment of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER] will be voted down, and I more sincerely hope that the amendment to the amendment, offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND], will be voted down. I repeat that if these amendments are voted down and any gentleman offers one to fix the salary at \$20,000 instead of \$18,000, I for one shall not object to it.

Mr. QUEZON. Mr. Chairman, both the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. JONES] and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER] have said so much regarding their ideas of the position of the Filipino people and of myself with reference to the salary of the Governor General that I believe it is time for me to say something about it myself.

Mr. Chairman, I do think that the salary of the Governor General of the Philippine Islands should be higher than it is now, and even higher than it was before that salary was reduced by the legislature, for reasons that I shall at once give to the committee. When the President of the United States was about to appoint the Governor General of the Philippine Islands I found that his concern was to find a man who was not only qualified, but also had enough private means to defray the expenses of his position. The President believed that the salary of the Governor General was such as to prevent the appointment of any but a rich man. You can readily see that with this belief in mind the President felt disposed to select his Governor General from among the wealthy men of this country. During a call I made at the White House the President told me that he was constrained to appoint a wealthy man as Governor of the Philippines, because his information was to the effect that no Governor General could live on the salary of the post. In view of these expressions we felt that we should pay the Governor General a salary high enough to permit the choice of the best man to be found for the appointment regardless of whether he be rich or poor. Thank God the President was able to find a man who, besides possessing wealth, had ability, character, and real desire to serve the Filipinos; otherwise I do not know what would have happened to us. We were more than fortunate when the President found Francis Burton Harrison, a man who had ability, character, and patriotism. [Applause.]

Of course I informed the speaker of the assembly of what had happened, and this explains why he thinks that the Governor General should have a high salary. Besides, he and I and the Filipino people know how expensive it is to fulfill the requirements of the position of the Governor General. But let not the idea enter your minds that we favor this salary for the Governor General because of our extravagant tendencies. Mr. Chairman, I wish to inform the committee—and this information is particularly pertinent in connection with the question asked by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND]—that the people of the Philippine Islands have expressed through the assembly their disapproval of some of the very high salaries paid to many of the officials of the Philippine Government. I refer particularly to the secretaries of departments, who, as commissioners and secretaries, receive a total of \$15,500 annually. The assembly has on several occasions tried to reduce the salaries of these officials. The Filipino people could not understand how under any circumstances such salaries as these could be defended.

Mr. BORLAND. Did I understand the gentleman to say that that was too high?

Mr. QUEZON. It is too high.

Mr. BORLAND. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. QUEZON. We think that it is absolutely indefensible for the members of the cabinet of the Governor General to be paid \$15,500 when the members of the Cabinet of the President of the United States only receive \$12,000 a year.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to reiterate what I said yesterday about Gov. Gen. Harrison's attitude regarding the question of his salary. The legislature would not reduce it when it reduced the salary of every other officer of the Philippine Government, but the Governor General himself thought that it must be done, since other salaries were reduced. He therefore insisted upon the action.

Mr. Chairman, I shall be frank enough to say that while I believe the salary of the Governor General is not at all sufficient unless he is given a certain amount as allowance for entertainment, I am not sure but that the salaries of the members of the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands could be somewhat reduced; but I shall not ask that this be done. I wish only to make the point that there is no due proportion between the salary of the Governor General on the one hand and the members of his cabinet and the justices of the supreme court on the other.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be recognized against the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri. I do not care to occupy more than a minute or two, because I have already expressed my feelings with respect to these salaries. Much has been said with reference to the salary enjoyed by Mr. Taft when he was Governor General. Something has been said in reference to the salary of the present Governor General, and the attitude of each is to their credit. Nothing has been said whatever in reference to another great Governor General, William Cameron Forbes, of Boston.

I want to say a word in respect to him. This may be surprising to a good many, but nevertheless it is entitled to the most serious reflection. I am told on the highest authority, so that there can be no question as to its accuracy, that during each of the four years that Mr. Forbes was Governor General of the islands he expended not less than \$100,000 out of his own pocket exclusively devoted to the public welfare of the islands. Not a bit of it in regal splendor, not a bit of it in sumptuous living, not a bit of it in extravagance, not a bit of it in wastefulness, but all of it devoted exclusively to the public work and to the welfare of the Filipino people.

I think the most powerful argument that has been made to-day is that made by the gentleman from the Philippine Islands [Mr. QUEZON] when he called the committee's attention to the difficulty confronting the President of the United States in selecting a suitable person to fill the high office of Governor General. It is the same thought that has come to me time and time again, and must have come to other members of the committee. It is a sad day for us or for any people when it is necessary to fill a high office with a man of great wealth. Do not give any salary that is ridiculously high, any salary that will attract Tom, Dick, and Harry for the purpose of the salary alone. No; not that for a moment, but do give a sufficient salary so that a man who has ability, whether he is wealthy or not, can take the office and fill it respectably. That ought to be good Democratic doctrine, and I think the Members on the other side of the aisle must acknowledge that it is good Democratic doctrine.

It seems to me that the testimony so far advanced is all to the effect that the Governor General should have at least \$18,000, and probably more than that, for a salary. I am willing to leave it to the Philippine Legislature. Is not that fair? Is it not really better to leave it to the people that are going to pay the bill than for us to say here what it shall be? Is it not better to leave it to the people who know the needs of the situation, rather than for us to legislate from this distant point?

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER], in a very clear and emphatic manner, called attention to the distinction between the Governor of Porto Rico and the Governor General of the Philippine Islands, a powerful argument in support of my amendment. The only correction I would offer by way of suggestion is that instead of its being 600 miles from the tip north end to the tip south end, it is 1,100 miles.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND].

The question was taken, and the substitute was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER].

The question was taken, and the amendment was lost.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 24, line 9, after the word "other," strike out the word "help" and insert the word "employees."

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I do not care to debate this amendment. I have offered it by way of suggestion, and if the chairman of the committee does not care to accept it, I do not care to urge it.

Mr. JONES. We will not oppose the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer another amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 24, after the word "each," in line 25, insert: "Provided, That the term of the Governor General shall not continue beyond the term of the President of the United States by whom he shall have been appointed, or until his successor is chosen and qualified."

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that that proposition has already been passed upon, and the further point of order that it is not germane to this section.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman indicate wherein it has already been passed upon? Does the gentleman make reference to section 21, page 17?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. That is correct. It is there provided in the bill:

He shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate of the United States, and hold his office at the pleasure of the President and until his successor is chosen and qualified.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, the amendment is germane, I think, since it follows almost literally the language just quoted by the gentleman from Tennessee, and is in entire harmony with it; it proposes, in addition, merely to fix a limitation upon the time that shall be served by the Governor General, to harmonize with the term of the President who appoints him.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, is the Chair prepared to rule upon that?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order based upon two propositions: First, that that question has already been disposed of; and, second, that it was not germane to the section now before the House. There is no doubt about it, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me. If the Chair is in doubt, I will be very glad to argue it.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit an interruption?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Certainly.

Mr. MOORE. Is there not a difference, in that the amendment proposes to harmonize the tenure of office of the Governor General with that of the President of the United States who makes his appointment?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Oh, Mr. Chairman, the adoption of the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania would qualify that provision in section 21 which has already been adopted, and if at any time such an amendment were to be proposed, it should have been proposed when section 21 was under consideration.

Mr. MANN. Do not the two propositions mean the same thing? One is that the term of the Governor General shall be at the pleasure of the President of the United States, and the other is that the term of the Governor General shall end with the term of the President, if he appoints somebody else.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. That is not what the amendment says.

Mr. MANN. Oh, yes.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be again reported.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will again report the amendment.

The Clerk again reported the amendment.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman will see that under the provision of section 21 the Governor General, once appointed, remains in office at the pleasure of the President, and under this proposed amendment identically the same thing takes place. There is no distinction. There may be an argument against the adoption of the amendment. It does not say that it ends with the term of the President, but it ends when his successor has been appointed.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, even if we concede that the first point I made is not well taken, the point still remains that it is not germane to this paragraph. If the gentleman desired to offer that amendment, he should have offered it at the time that we had section 21 under consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is of opinion that this amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania is not germane to this section, and therefore sustains the point of order.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 24, line 25, after the word "each," insert "Provided, That no Governor General shall be paid at the rate of \$18,000 per annum to exceed the aggregate of \$72,000."

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I think this is a little more germane, if the gentleman will permit.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. It is a little less meaningless.

Mr. MOORE. I think it has a great deal of meaning.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Oh, it fixes a four-year term. Is that the idea?

Mr. MOORE. That is the idea.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Then, Mr. Chairman, it is subject to the point of order, and I make the point of order.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I do not think that in the discussion anywhere, nor in any action taken by the committee thus far—

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, how many more amendments has the gentleman to this section?

Mr. MOORE. I think I have two germane amendments. I will be very frank with the gentleman. I desire to say something about the limitation of the tenure of office of the Governor General.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Then, Mr. Chairman, I will reserve the point of order.

Mr. MOORE. It may involve the general question of political ethics, but I think it is all pertinent to the discussion.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman knows what good faith means. Is it a good-faith discussion of this amendment or of this bill?

Mr. MOORE. I would not offer it if I did not mean to say something in good faith to the committee. We are now discussing a bill which is fraught with great consequences to a people numbering eight million or more. We are undertaking to establish a form of government for them. We are giving them the best advice of which we are capable. We are putting to them the pretense, at least, of liberty and freedom of action on their own part, but we are adding certain strings which tie them up, and about which it seems to me we ought to inform them. If, for instance, we give the people of the Philippine Islands to believe that they shall have their freedom and independence, and their own right of action without restraint on our part, we ought to say that frankly, and we ought not to hamstring it in a way to lead them to believe that they have been deceived by the American Congress. My purpose is to discuss the matter of the tenure of office. I have an amendment pertaining to the tenure of office of those who are appointed by the President and by the Governor General.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman's time is running, as I understand it.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I was answering the gentleman because he wanted to be enlightened upon the question of good faith. If the Chair is ready to rule on the point of order—

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. MOORE. Then, Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk and ask to have read.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 24, after the word "Philippines," in line 18, strike out the period and insert a comma and the following words: "but all officials of the Philippines appointed by the President shall hold office at the pleasure of the President and until his successor is chosen and qualified."

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman make any point against that? He does not? Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment with the view of bringing to the attention of the committee the importance of our exercising good faith toward the people of the Philippine Islands. The Democratic Party is undertaking by this bill to lead the people of the Philippines to believe that the United States intends to give them their freedom and their exclusive right of government. The bill justifies that pretense as set out in the preambles, which are yet to be acted upon, but the enacting clauses of it hold the people of the Philippine Islands in check with regard to many of their so-called legislative functions. The bill reserves to the Congress and the President of the United States certain jurisdiction over the people of the Philippine Islands that they may not clearly understand if these preambles to the bill are accepted as the action of the Congress. To that extent the bill is unfair to the Filipinos themselves.

I have offered this amendment with a view of calling attention to the good faith that Congress ought to display toward these people. That question of good faith has been raised, and I have the right to suggest that, so long as it has been raised by a member of the majority party, we can refer to the action of that party not only with respect to its treatment of the Filipinos but with respect to its treatment of the people of the United States. Thus the people of the Philippine Islands may judge for themselves whether by this legislation "good faith" toward them is intended or not.

Now, I propose a limitation upon the tenure of office both for the Governor General and all local officers appointed in the Philippine Islands. On the question of good faith we have the testimony of the Democratic Party itself with respect to the tenure of office of the President of the United States. At the Baltimore convention, when the platform of that party was read, it provided:

We favor a single presidential term, and to that end urge the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution making the President of the United States ineligible to reelection, and we pledge the candidate of this convention to this principle.

So your party pledged the President of the United States "to this principle," and yet in the newspapers of yesterday morning we read—I am quoting from the New York Times—headlines as follows:

"Wilson blocked one-term bill." "Letter he wrote to A. MITCHELL PALMER in 1913 said to have sidetracked it." "It develops that House committee filed Senate measure on advice of President elect." "Silent on Baltimore plank"

Now, in the matter of "good faith" there is something for the people of the United States as well as for the people of the Philippines to consider. What are those people over yonder in those islands, whom we take by the hand to lead so they may tread by themselves—what are they to think of the "good faith" of the United States Congress passing a bill which in its preamble gives them freedom and which in its vital clauses holds them up to limitations from which they can not escape?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, as I listened to the gentleman from Pennsylvania attacking the present administration I was reminded of a poem which I read many years ago. Now, it may seem strange—I know it will seem strange—that the gentleman from Pennsylvania should remind anyone of poetry [laughter] in the first instance, but perhaps after the committee shall have heard the poetry to which I refer it will not seem so strange. It has been many years ago since I read it, and I do not know that I can recall the lines with exactness; but I think I can quote them with substantial accuracy. This poem read:

A LITTLE DOG.
A little dog barked at the big, round moon,
Which smiled in the evening sky,
And the natives smote him with rocks and stones,
But still he continued his rageful tones,
And he barked till his throat was dry.
Oh, the little dog bounced like a rubber ball,
For his anger quite drove him wild;
And he said, "I'm a terror, although I am small,
And I dare you, impudent fellow, to fail."
But the moon only smiled and smiled.
But at length, 'hind a cloud which obstructed the west,
The moon sank down out of sight,
And it smiled as it slowly slipped over the crest,
But the little dog said, as he laid down to rest,
"Well, I scared him away, all right."

[Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. The last recourse of a man who has no argument is ridicule, and ridicule is one of the best arguments that can be employed by one who has no other means to stop an adversary. The gentleman has quoted his little-dog poem, not literally, but he has so quoted it as to present no possible argument at all upon the question at issue. The gentleman knew I did not have the time in which to fully explain the question I desired to raise a little while ago, but he has aroused me now sufficiently to say to him that his little-dog argument has no special effect upon me, since I am endeavoring to do my duty by the people, and am endeavoring honestly to inform the Filipinos, for whom we are legislating, as to just what the intended legislation is.

The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] has not said a word about the sudden change of front of the Democratic Party, for which he speaks, upon the question of one term for the President. The gentleman knows that in the Baltimore platform, which was the gospel of his party, it was provided that the President of the United States should have one term and that the party pledged its candidate to one term. The gentleman also knows that there has been a change of front since that party platform was adopted, and that the President him-

self has sent to the Judiciary Committee of this House a notification that he does not desire that party platform observed. This is in line with other instances of pledge-breaking by the Democratic Party, as, for instance, in the matter of the Panama Canal tolls. The Democratic Party pledged this Nation that ships should pass through the Panama Canal free. It went back on that pledge; it reneged on that pledge; and it now has to resort to "Little dog Tray" to excuse it for its bad faith to the American people.

The Democratic Party has done more than this. It has recently brought out its textbook for the use of orators to go out and again fool the American people. And in this textbook, from cover to cover, there is not one line of the Democratic platform adopted at Baltimore upon which the Democratic Party deceived the people of the United States in the election of 1912. Apparently the party does not now stand upon that platform. Oh, if you will deceive 90,000,000 people in this way on the Panama Canal plank and the one-term presidential plank, what will you do with these civilized and semicivilized millions of people in the Philippine Islands to whom you are making promises to-day? [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. SAUNDERS). The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DONOVAN. Does the Chair understand that the debate on this bill ought to be confined to the subject matter of the bill?

The CHAIRMAN. That is the understanding of the Chair.

Mr. DONOVAN. Then I would like to inquire by what means did this gentleman get the right to utter this tirade we have been obliged to listen to?

The CHAIRMAN. If the gentleman from Connecticut had wanted to interrupt the gentleman from Pennsylvania he could have done so when he was speaking.

Mr. DONOVAN. It is remarkable what an intellectual gentleman will do. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend, on page 24, lines 11 and 12, by striking out the words "and approved by the Governor General."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 24, lines 11 and 12, strike out the words "and approved by the Governor General."

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to get the attention of the gentleman in charge of the bill. The language of this section provides that all of the officials and employees not named by the President shall have salaries to be fixed by the Philippine Legislature, as I understand it, and to be approved by the Governor General.

Now, the only way the Philippine Legislature can act is by passing a bill, and we have already provided in this bill that the Governor General may veto a bill passed by the legislature, and also provided a method by which that bill can be passed over the veto if it shall be approved by the President. Now comes this provision specifically requiring that the salaries of all these officials shall be approved by the Governor General. There is an apparent conflict in the two provisions of this bill, and under this language, if this remains in, any bill which is passed by the Philippine Legislature fixing a salary can not be passed over the veto of the Governor General, even if it be approved by the President. Was that the design of the committee, may I ask, or is that something that was taken out of the present law?

Mr. JONES. I do not think that was the idea of the committee. So far as I am concerned, I see no objection to the elimination of that language.

Mr. MANN. Well, it seemed to me there was a conflict. I think it is already covered fully, and I am afraid this would make trouble.

Mr. JONES. The committee did not think, of course, there was any conflict; but I am willing to put the matter beyond any question of doubt.

Mr. MANN. I think this, probably, may be in the existing law.

Mr. JONES. That is.

Mr. MANN. Well, of course, under the existing law there is no way of passing a bill over the veto of the Governor General, as I understand, and you have already provided for that.

Mr. JONES. I think there will be no objection on this side.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out, in lines 12, 13, and 14, on page 24, the language:

And if the legislature shall fail to make an appropriation for such salaries the salaries so fixed shall be paid without the necessity of further appropriations therefor.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.
The Clerk read as follows:

Page 24, lines 12, 13, and 14, strike out the following language:
"And if the legislature shall fail to make an appropriation for such salaries, the salaries so fixed shall be paid without the necessity of further appropriations therefor."

Mr. MANN. Is there not in the bill a provision that if an appropriation act shall not be passed that the former appropriation—

Mr. JONES. That is applied to the general appropriation act.

Mr. MANN. That is true. But here, supposing the Philippine Legislature wants to discontinue an office that ought to be discontinued? We know our method frequently is not to make an appropriation for that office, and it may be—and is true—that in legislative bodies it is sometimes much easier to drop an appropriation from an appropriation bill where it ought to be dropped than it is to pass a bill repealing the law that created the office.

Now, what objection can there be to leaving the appropriation for these offices created by the Philippine Legislature to the Philippine Legislature when it comes to providing the salaries? Certainly there is no desire on the part of anybody, if there is a useless office over there, to continue to pay the salary of the office, although the Philippine Legislature may refuse to make the appropriation for it. If they fail to pass the appropriation bills, as I understand, these salaries will be continued anyhow; that is, if an appropriation bill does not pass this year, then the appropriation act of last year remains in force. But this would seem to prevent the opportunity to discontinue a useless office, and we who have been here very long know that it is a very difficult matter to do at the best, and I do not believe in discouraging a legislative body that can find it can do without a job.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield to the gentleman from Iowa?

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. TOWNER. Calling the gentleman's attention to the language on page 15, the provision is as follows:

If at the termination of any fiscal year the appropriations necessary for the support of government for the ensuing fiscal year shall not have been made, the several sums appropriated in the last appropriation bills for the objects and purposes therein specified, so far as the same may be done, shall be deemed to be reappropriated for the several objects and purposes specified in said last appropriation bill; and until the legislature shall act in such behalf the treasurer shall, when so directed by the Governor General, make the payments necessary for the purposes aforesaid.

That would allow the continuation of the appropriation for the salaries of officers. That would certainly be for the support of the government.

Mr. MANN. Certainly; if no appropriation is made, then these appropriations are continued in force.

Mr. TOWNER. So that the language used in this section that the gentleman moves to strike out is entirely unnecessary.

Mr. MANN. I take it that this provision was in the existing law. I do not know and have not ascertained, but I take it that it was for the very purpose of preventing the lower house over there from refusing to pay the salaries; but I do not think that applies now.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I will say to the gentleman that it is in existing law, and also that provision in section 15 is in existing law, with a certain modification.

Mr. MANN. I understand. But does not the gentleman think that we can afford to trust the Philippine Legislature to make the appropriations for those salaries for offices they create when the salaries are necessary and when the offices are necessary to be continued?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. If the gentleman will permit me, I will say I have no doubt he has in mind especially clerical places and things of that sort; but if this were stricken out, if you strike out the salary of the head of a bureau or a high executive officer, would it not—

Mr. MANN. Well, even then, if the Philippine Legislature should conclude that a certain high place can be abolished which it has created, why should it not be permitted to do that? That is not going very far in self-government. For instance, supposing that we want to change an office, as we do sometimes here in Washington, discontinue one office and create another office. Under the terms of this, if you wanted to create an office you could, but you could not discontinue an office by dropping the appropriation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I call the gentleman's attention to the language on page 20, beginning in line 9:

There shall be established by the Philippine Legislature a bureau, to be known as the bureau of non-Christian tribes, which said bureau shall be embraced in one of the executive departments to be designated by the Governor General, and shall have general supervision over the public affairs of the inhabitants of the territory represented in the legislature by appointive senators and representatives.

Now, the gentleman knows, of course, the delicacy of dealing with the non-Christian tribes in the Philippine Islands. I should not like to make it possible—I should rather go to the extent of tautology, if that were necessary—to prevent the possibility of the Philippine Legislature, if it should desire to do what I do not think it would desire to do, to abolish this bureau.

Mr. MANN. Well, I quite agree with the gentleman about that. But supposing the Philippine Legislature did not create this bureau?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. This act creates it.

Mr. MANN. Oh, no. It says, "There shall be established by the Philippine Legislature a bureau." Suppose the Philippine Legislature did not create the bureau. We are not passing all power out of our hands, and that is why the gentleman knows the Philippine Legislature will create the bureau, because if the Philippine Legislature did not create the bureau and Congress wanted it, Congress would create it. We have the power at any time, and if the Philippine Legislature would create a bureau by direction of the organic act and fail to make an appropriation for it, we would have the power to do it. I do not think there is any chance of their failing.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. We also continue the laws in existence. I would rather not take two bites at the cherry, seeing how difficult it is to take one bite.

Mr. MANN. I do not think we shall have to take two bites, but it seems to me that it is desirable to leave the power in the legislature to create and abolish a salary when they think it is a useless office. We know sometimes it is very effective here, and we know also that it is a frequent thing in the appropriation acts here to leave out one office, the title of an office, and to reestablish it under another title with slightly changed jurisdiction. Under the terms of this provision I do not know whether that could be done. I doubt it.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Well, of course the gentleman understands that they can carry that provision in the appropriation bill, and if the Governor General should veto that item, it would not become a law. But there is nothing here to prohibit them from abolishing the office if it became a law.

Mr. MANN. There is nothing to prevent them from passing a law and abolishing the office.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. They can do that upon an appropriation bill.

Mr. MANN. That will depend upon their rules. They will probably have rules something like ours, where legislation on an appropriation act is not permissible. I venture to say that if this provision were in our Constitution it would have cost our Government many millions of dollars, and often a large sum of money on any appropriation bill.

Mr. QUEZON. Mr. Chairman, I hope the committee will accept the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN]. I think that section of this bill which permits the continuation of a previous appropriation in case the legislature should fail to pass a new measure is enough protection against the danger that the government of the Philippine Islands might be left without any means of support. I do not think that this language should be retained if it leaves a doubt as to the power of the legislature to abolish unnecessary bureaus or offices.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I just want to say that I do not think there is any necessity for striking this out, but personally I have no objection to doing it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Chairman, an amendment is pending, by unanimous consent, from yesterday—section 23a.

Mr. JONES. I suggest that we finish these two sections first.

Mr. STAFFORD. I thought it was the understanding that we take it up after the consideration of this was completed.

Mr. JONES. I have no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. It was to be referred to by unanimous consent?

Mr. STAFFORD. By agreement, Mr. Chairman. It can be returned to by agreement.

Mr. BRYAN. Unanimous consent has been granted to go back; but to continue it on the calendar as it is, unanimous consent is not necessary.

Mr. STAFFORD. I would like to have it considered at the present time, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. JONES. Very well. Go ahead.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment referred to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert as a new section, section 26a, the following:

"The sale, manufacture for sale, transportation for sale, importation for sale, and exportation for sale of intoxicating liquors for beverage purposes in the Philippine Islands and all territory subject to the jurisdiction thereof are forever prohibited. The Philippine Legislature shall have power to provide for the manufacture, sale, importation, and transportation of intoxicating liquors for sacramental, medicinal, mechanical, pharmaceutical, or scientific purposes, or for use in the arts, and shall have power to enforce this article by all needful legislation."

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, the amendment which is offered is the Hobson amendment providing for national prohibition in its identical wording, excepting that "the Philippines" is substituted in place of "the United States." I am as much opposed to the original Hobson national prohibition amendment extending over the entire United States as I am to this amendment, which limits it to the Philippines. The principle in both cases is the same. The National Government has no right to legislate on a matter of purely State or internal policy.

There is a fundamental principle under our form of government that matters pertaining to the health, happiness, and internal affairs of a State are for the State to pass upon through its legislature. So in the bill under consideration we are following out that idea and vesting in the Philippine Legislature the right to legislate on all matters pertaining to the welfare of the Filipino people.

No question is better recognized as being a matter of local concern than the regulation of the liquor traffic, and nothing is better established in the history of liquor regulations than that where a State attempts to force prohibition upon a people in a community where the sentiment is lacking for its enforcement that prohibition becomes a farce and a dead letter. This is evidenced in the New England States in trying to enforce prohibition in New Hampshire, Vermont, and Maine when public opinion was averse to it. Every Member of Congress from Vermont with whom I have ever spoken admits, even though they themselves have been teetotalers, that conditions are far better under the present system of local option than under the former system of State-wide prohibition. The people who are not fanatical on this subject have no question that the conditions in Maine would be far better than under the farcical enforcement, or, rather, lack of enforcement, of the State prohibitory law.

Believing as I do in the principle of local government, and this bill being bottomed on that idea of granting to the Philippines the greatest amount of government that is compatible with its welfare, is the reason why I make a point of order against this obnoxious amendment to the freedom of action of the Filipino people.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I wish to address myself for a few minutes to the parliamentary proposition. A point of order was made against this prohibition amendment by me last night, and I renew it again on the ground that it is not germane either to the provisions of the bill or to the paragraph or section of the bill we are now considering.

I wish first to direct the Chairman's attention to the title of the bill. It is a bill to declare the purpose of the people of the United States as to the future political status of the people of the Philippine Islands, and to provide a more autonomous government for those islands.

If the Chair will scan the various provisions in the bill we have thus far considered, he will find first a bill of rights, then a statement of the legislative authority of the islands, the powers of the legislature, then the powers of the Executive, and now we virtually have concluded the consideration of all those matters and are considering merely the question of appointments to some of the executive positions.

The Chair is acquainted with clause 7 of Rule XVI, which provides that no motion or proposition on a subject different from that under consideration shall be admitted under color of amendment.

In the first place, Mr. Chairman, I would not contend that if at the proper place, for instance section 6, an amendment had been offered reserving to the Congress of the United States the power to pass upon the liquor question, or excepting that

power from the legislative authority conferred upon the Philippine Legislature, that it would not have been germane; or to that section which relates to the powers of the Governor General that he should have authority as to the administration of the liquor traffic in the Philippine Islands; but I do contend, first, that there is nothing to this bill to indicate to any Member of the House that a prohibition amendment was likely to be considered, forbidding the sale and manufacture of liquors in the Philippine Islands. For the Chair to hold that this amendment is in order the Chair would have to hold that an amendment I might introduce extending the provisions of the Underwood tariff bill to be the internal policy of the Philippines would be in order. It would also, if I offered an amendment fixing the Glass-Owen currency bill as the currency to be established in the Philippine Islands, have to be held in order, or if I should offer an amendment providing that an appropriation for rivers and harbors shall be to the extent of \$20,000,000 annually appropriated by Congress, would also have to be held in order.

But there is nothing in any part of this bill, from beginning to end, which attempts to determine the legislative policy by the Congress as to its internal or external policy.

Mr. GOULDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

Mr. GOULDEN. Does not the gentleman think that a question of this character affecting the internal policy of the government should be left to the legislature?

Mr. STAFFORD. There is no question as to the merits of the proposition, as I have just stated, that it should be left entirely to the legislature as a matter of home rule. The bill is predicated on the idea that the Filipinos are capable of governing themselves, and if they are, it should be left to them to determine their internal policy. No more should Congress determine the policy in the Philippines as to the liquor traffic, if we are transferring all legislative authority over their affairs to a constituted legislative body, than that Congress should determine as a national question national prohibition, where State legislatures exist, with the full power to determine what is best for the State's own welfare. But this amendment is part and parcel of the movement for national prohibition, and, believing as I do, that that Government is best which comes nearest to the people, and that States through their legislatures should determine their internal affairs, I intend to use my best endeavors to defeat this prohibition amendment.

Mr. GOULDEN. Will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

Mr. GOULDEN. As a matter of revenue for the people of the Philippines, should not they be allowed to decide that question for themselves?

Mr. STAFFORD. Why, yes; just as I have argued that it would not be in harmony with the provisions of this bill for any Member to offer the provisions of the Underwood tariff and say that it should be applicable as a tariff policy for the Philippine Islands, and that is what this amendment is seeking to accomplish.

Why there are some Members who, as long as it does not affect their districts, would impose conditions on others that would be harsh and unworkable and absolutely work an injustice. It is no concern to them as to the revenues that will result, and even now, as the gentlemen know, there is a strong movement to impose on the beer industry a greater burden than it justly should bear. No objection was made by the beer-consuming public to a reasonable tax of 50 cents additional per barrel on beer to meet any possible deficit that might arise by reason of the European war, though from my point of view I consider that no such exigency exists, and accordingly have opposed this war-revenue bill. But it is now proposed to increase this by one-half and make the tax \$1.75 per barrel, which would make the beer-consuming public pay nearly \$50,000,000, or about one-half of the total tax to be raised to meet the deficiency. This I consider most unjust, especially as it is a substitute for the gasoline tax, which would have to be paid by the automobile users.

Let no one mistake the effect of this tax in that by raising the price of beer to the saloon keeper and to the thousands of people who purchase cases of bottled beer for home consumption that its ultimate effect by increasing the price to the consuming public will be to lessen the production of this beverage that is regarded as almost nonintoxicating. This burden will fall upon the poor man and not the rich, as beer is a poor man's drink, and when the defenders of this war-revenue bill claim that this tax is upon luxuries they are strangers entirely to the conditions and are imposing a burden that will be most directly felt by the working and middle classes. When \$48,000,000 additional beer tax is to be thus levied I protest and will continue

to protest that it is unjust, inequitable, and sectional in its character.

Mr. Chairman, the supporters of this amendment are forcing their views upon others with no voice to oppose, against which, as a Representative of a district of liberty-loving people, I strongly protest. I am not in sympathy with any rule of absolutism that would take away the liberty of the individual.

I have digressed somewhat from the discussion of the parliamentary question, but this digression was suggested by the question of the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOULDEN].

Now, I wish to direct the chairman's attention to one or two brief statements in the manual under clause 7 of Rule XVI, and particularly to subclause D, on page 344, which says that two subjects are not necessarily germane because they are related.

The first reference thereunder is this (these were held to be not germane):

To a proposition relating to the terms of Senators an amendment changing the manner of their election; to a bill relating to commerce between the States an amendment relating to commerce within the several States; to a proposition for the appointment of a select committee to investigate a certain subject an amendment proposing an inquiry of the executive on that subject.

I wish to direct the attention of the Chair to the latest expression—and perhaps the Chair was present when the Representative from New York, Mr. JOHN J. FITZGERALD, whom we all regard as one of the best parliamentarians in this body, was chairman of the committee on September 22 last in the consideration of the conservation bill providing for the leasing of coal, oil, and mineral lands of the country. There was a special provision under consideration for the disposition of the funds or rentals accruing from those Government lands when the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] offered an amendment that the funds should be used for the purpose of the building of good roads.

I know of no decision anywhere on the subject of germaneness that is so comprehensive and so enlightening as this decision of Mr. FITZGERALD. In that opinion he states that it had been intimated that the question would arise, and he had given the subject, as the opinion shows, considerable thought and consideration.

I direct the Chair's attention to that decision, and particularly to certain language in it. The gist of the decision is, as to the question of germaneness, whether the amendment that is offered could reasonably be anticipated, or could the Members consider that the amendment would be a logical sequence of the provisions of the bill.

I wish to read the following:

The meaning of the word "germane" is akin to, or near to, or appropriate to, or relevant to, and "germane" amendments must bear such relationship to the provisions of the bill as well as meet the other tests; that is, that they be a natural and logical sequence to the subject matter and propose such modifications as would naturally, properly, and reasonably be anticipated.

Again, on page 15553, Mr. FITZGERALD said:

If it be apparent that the amendment proposes some modification of the bill, or of any part of it, which from the declared purposes of the bill could not reasonably have been anticipated and which can not be said to be a logical sequence of the matter contained in the bill, and is not such a modification as would naturally suggest itself to the legislative body considering the bill, the amendment can not be said to be germane.

In his concluding remarks he said:

It seems to the Chair that, applying these tests to the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] to determine whether it is germane, the question to be answered is whether the amendment is relevant, appropriate, and a natural and logical sequence to the subject matter of the bill. It is quite clear to the Chair that the amendment can not be so characterized, and that the committee could not have anticipated or reasonably expected that to a proposition that the money to be derived from the royalties of the leases authorized to be made under this legislation should be put in the reclamation fund, a well-established fund created for specific and definite purposes; that a proposition to create a new fund, to be known as the "national good-roads fund," could be considered as a natural, appropriate, relevant, and logical sequence to the proposal in the bill; and therefore the Chair sustains the point of order.

Again, here is a pertinent suggestion by Mr. FITZGERALD that may be of some value to the Chair in this matter, to be found on page 15555, near the top of the first column:

Very frequently the difficulty in reaching a conclusion as to whether an amendment is germane arises from the fact that while the proposed amendment is somewhat similar to the subject matter of the bill, the particular predilection of Members favorable to the amendment makes them reason themselves into a frame of mind to believe the amendment to be germane without careful analysis of its relation to the matter proposed to be amended. * * * It seems to the Chair that such proposals could not reasonably be anticipated, nor could they be held as logical sequences to the provision in the bill.

Following out the logic of that opinion—and I repeat that I consider it the best opinion that has ever been delivered upon

this subject of germaneness—I contend, Mr. Chairman, that the prohibitory amendment now proposed, which seeks to determine the legislative policy of the Philippines in advance, could not have been anticipated as naturally being a relevant proposition to the consideration of this bill. No more so than if some Member would offer the Underwood Tariff Act, as I suggested a moment ago, to determine the tariff policy of the Philippine Islands. This bill is founded entirely, from first to last, on the fundamental idea that the Philippines themselves shall determine through their legislature their internal and external policies.

I now wish merely to come to this other question, and that is, if it might have been in order, if the Chair should hold that it is germane to other provisions of the bill, it can not be held to be germane to this section. The amendment embodies a legislative policy, and it is a fundamental rule of germaneness that the paragraph must be germane to the section under consideration. If the Chair desires any authority upon that I have some authorities along that line. In *Hinds' Precedents*, Volume V, paragraph 5822, we find this language:

An amendment inserting an additional section should be germane to the portion of the bill where it is offered.

As the Chair knows, the reason for that is predicated upon the idea of expedition in the consideration of bills. If a Member should be granted freedom at any time, anywhere, to introduce any amendment to the body of the bill, there would be no end to the consideration of that measure in case some Member should wish to indulge in a filibuster. Assuming that the amendment is germane to the general provisions of the bill, then I contend it should have been offered to that section of the bill which relates to the legislative power, but the section under consideration here does not relate to the legislative powers. The powers of the Philippine Legislature were referred to in sections 3 and 6, prior sections of the bill.

Just to make a brief résumé, I do not contend, Mr. Chairman, that if an amendment had been offered at the proper place, stating that the Philippine Legislature could not have authority to pass upon the liquor question, that that would not have been in order at that place, nor do I contend that it would not have been in order if an amendment delegating that authority to the Governor General had been offered, but I do contend that it is foreign to the whole scope of this bill to introduce a legislative enactment that shall apply to the Philippine Islands direct. The title of the bill and every paragraph in it shows that that was not the policy or intent of the committee in introducing it, and that no Member of the House could reasonably anticipate that any such proposition would be submitted for consideration.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Chairman, briefly on the point of order. I am very glad that the point is to be submitted to a gentleman who can not be influenced by the suggestions of revenue or suggestions of home rule, coming, as he does, from the State of Virginia, for there the gentleman has heard all of these arguments and has passed on those matters outside of this Chamber. This bill states in the title that it is a bill to provide a more autonomous government for the Philippine Islands. The fact that it grants rights to the Philippine Islands, privileges to the Legislature of the Philippine Islands, necessarily carries with it that it reserves from the legislature such rights and such privileges and such large powers as this Congress may deem wise to reserve from that legislature. We can not grant these rights without reserving the rights that we do not grant, and under that broad head of granting a more autonomous government we are here to determine what constitutes a more autonomous government. We are here to determine where we are going to restrict and where we are going to extend privileges. Page 9 of the bill, section 12, provides that all local legislative powers of the Philippines, "except as herein otherwise provided," shall be vested in the legislature. "Except as herein otherwise provided." That is the purpose of the bill—to make provisions otherwise wherever it is the will of Congress to do so. We begin right at the very first of the bill and provide that they shall not pass laws abridging life, liberty, and property, and then we pass another section restraining the Philippine Legislature from denying to an accused person the right of counsel, and we deny them the right to pass any law that puts any person twice in jeopardy, and we restrict their rights as to passing laws concerning bail and obligations of contract and imprisonment for debt and the right of habeas corpus.

We regulate taxes and we provide how far they can go on the subject to taxation. All through the bill these provisions and restrictions are set forth. It is just as much a bill to restrict the legislature to reserve rights as it is to grant those that we may choose to give to the legislature. The gentleman from Wisconsin, in his argument on behalf of the point of order,

suggests that if this were permitted in the form which he has stated at a different place, it perhaps would be in order. Now, the place where my amendment is submitted, or, rather, the point raised will attain with less force at the place where it is submitted, it seems to me, than any other place in the bill. This section 26 deals with franchises, concessions from the government of the islands to private parties, to corporations, to licensees, to those who come to the government and ask for privileges from the government. The gentleman who sits in the chair well knows that the United States Supreme Court has held that no man has the inherent right to sell intoxicating liquor, no man has the right to sell these debauching drugs to the public, and that sales of liquors are restricted on that ground, and every corporation, every State, every municipality has the inherent right to fix licenses and state conditions under which franchises will be given. Now, in these sections we have provided how franchises on the public domain, how franchises on the public land, how franchises of public utilities are to be granted, under what condition water rights will be granted, under what conditions we will allow the right to furnish gas to a municipality to be granted to a private concern. All of these grants, all of these concessions, all of these franchises are made the subject of regulations in this very preceding section. Now, Mr. Chairman, that point, of course, would not be resorted to except in the most extreme case, and the most liberal interpretation would be due in reference to that feature, but by a strict interpretation this is the very place for this amendment. This is the very location for it, and it is an independent section, not an amendment to any other section, and I submit to the Chair that there is no rhyme or reason in the argument of the gentleman from Wisconsin. I submit that this committee has the right, without any shadow of question, without any thought in any parliamentarian's mind, sincerely and earnestly I believe that this committee has the right to say to the Philippine Legislature that we shall not permit the grant of this liquor franchise if they see fit to so do, and that this is the very place in the bill to say it, if we care to say it at all.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. SAUNDERS). The Chair is ready to rule. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD], makes two points of order against the amendment submitted by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. BRYAN]. First, that the amendment is not germane to the bill, and therefore is not in order under any circumstances. Second, that if it is germane to the bill, it is not germane to the portion of the bill under consideration, and hence is not in order at this time. Many decisions have been rendered upon the subject of germane, and nongermane amendments. Some of these decisions are plainly right, and easily referable to established principles. Others rest upon the most subtle and hairsplitting distinctions. Still others are flatly contradictory, and hopelessly irreconcilable. Should the first objection to the pending amendment be sustained, the ruling of the Chair would, in effect, be a declaration that the amendment presents a proposition unrelated to the subject matter of the bill. But is such the case? It is true that we find in the title of the bill a statement that this measure is intended to declare the purpose of the people of the United States as to the future political status of the people of the Philippine Islands, but it is further stated, that the bill is to provide a more autonomous government for the islands. In pursuance of, and in conformity with the latter declaration, the bill deals in great detail with the internal affairs, and domestic economy of the Philippine people. Section 3 affords many positive rights to the people of these islands, limits in many directions the powers of the Philippine Legislature, and contains many inhibitions relating to procedure, practices, and pursuits. For instance it is declared in this section, that neither slavery, nor involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime, whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist in said islands.

If it is in harmony with the purpose of this bill, to provide that a state of slavery, and the traffic in human liberty, shall not exist in the Philippines, it is not perceived why an inhibition directed against the manufacture of, and the traffic in ardent spirits, is not in order under, and directly related to, the subject matter of this section which is intended to establish by law and make effective certain fundamental principles deemed essential to the future welfare, prosperity, and progress of the Filipinos. The first objection of the gentleman from Wisconsin is overruled, the Chair being of opinion that the amendment under consideration is plainly germane to the bill. The second objection of the gentleman from Wisconsin presents a more difficult question for determination. Conceding pro arguendo, that the amendment is germane to the bill, it is insisted that it is not in order in the connection in which it is offered, in other words that it is not in harmony so to say, with its proposed

environment. While the decisions relating to germaneness in this connection are conflicting, yet on the whole it may be considered as fairly established, that an amendment of this character, should be germane to the portion of the bill where it is offered. Hence it follows that to be in order, this amendment should be offered in its appropriate connection, unless it falls within the principle relating to amendments that are germane to the bill, and in some degree germane to different sections thereof. In that event the proponent of the amendment may select the connection in which he will offer it. See Fifth Hinds, sections 5822, and 5823.

Looking to the section of the pending bill which the proposed amendment is to follow, as a new section, it will be apparent that this amendment is in no wise germane to that section. If the Chair were not assured in his mind that the amendment is germane to section 3 of the bill which has been passed, so that full opportunity has been afforded to offer the same at a time when it was plainly, clearly, and positively in order; or if the Chair were of opinion that it was germane to more than one section of the bill, including the connection in which it is now offered, the Chair would have no hesitation in holding the same to be now in order. But the Chair is not in doubt either on the first, or the second point. The amendment was plainly germane to section 3, and therefore appropriate to be offered in that connection. It is not germane to section 26 which it is intended to succeed as a new section. Hence it falls within the rule that an amendment inserted as an additional section, should be germane to that portion of the bill where it is offered. (5 Hinds, sec. 5822.) The Chair sustains the second point of order raised by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Crockett, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. J. Res. 188. Joint resolution ceding to the State of California temporary jurisdiction over certain lands in the Presidio of San Francisco and Fort Mason (Cal.) Military Reservations.

THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS.

The committee resumed its session.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 29. That all laws or parts of laws applicable to the Philippines not in conflict with any of the provisions of this act are hereby continued in force and effect.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Chairman, I do not care to argue the matter, but I am going to offer the amendment I suggested here—the prohibition amendment—after section 27, and I shall do so in every section from now on.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, the amendment has not been reported, and of course I can not make the point of order, but the gentleman can not proceed with debate until his amendment is reported.

Mr. BRYAN. We have had the amendment read. It is the same as was read a moment ago, except it is to come after section 27 instead of section 26.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. BRYAN] asks unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

Mr. STAFFORD. Reserving the right to object, I presume the waiving of the reading will not interfere with my making a point of order. I make the point of order, Mr. Chairman, that the amendment offered is not germane to this section, and, furthermore, it has already been passed upon and is dilatory.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 29. That all laws or parts of laws applicable to the Philippines not in conflict with any of the provisions of this act are hereby continued in force and effect.

Mr. JONES and Mr. TOWNER rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER] is recognized.

Mr. TOWNER. I ask the attention of the chairman of the committee. I ask unanimous consent to return to section 22, on page 20.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Chairman, before that return is made, may I ask if section 29 has been read? I want to offer an amendment after section 29.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have somebody move for the reconsideration of that section. Somebody who voted against that amendment should move its reconsideration.

Mr. JONES. I ask that the gentleman withhold his request for the present. There are two sections that we are to return to, and I would like to perfect those before we take up anything new.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Chairman, the section I offered awhile ago I would offer now as section No. 30. There is an old adage that it is never too late to do good. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

Mr. STAFFORD. Without waiving the right to make the point of order against it, I do not object. I now make the point of order that the amendment is not germane to this section of the bill, and, further, I make the point of order that the amendment is dilatory.

Mr. BRYAN. I desire, Mr. Chairman, to be heard briefly on that. This is entirely a different proposition. This amendment is offered here as section 30. The distinguished gentleman who has just left the chair held that the proposition was germane to this bill, but that it was not germane when being put in as section 26a, between these various propositions that were involved there; but here is a section—section 29—which says:

That all laws or parts of laws applicable to the Philippines not in conflict with any of the provisions of this act are hereby continued in force and effect.

Now, what is germane to that? What is the proposition that is involved in that section? That is a proposition as to what laws shall be continued in force, what laws shall be repealed, and what laws shall be observed from now on in the Philippine Islands. There is nothing there about public lands, there is nothing there about salaries to officers, there is nothing there about these propositions that the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin presented a while ago and on which he obtained the ruling from the able Chairman who was presiding at that time. Not at all. The amendment I have proposed is applicable to that section, which says:

That all laws or parts of laws applicable to the Philippines not in conflict with any of the provisions of this act are hereby continued in force and effect.

Now, that is a very broad subject. That is as broad a subject as all the enactments that we have heretofore made in regard to the Philippine Islands. It involves the question of involuntary servitude, which the gentleman spoke of a few moments ago. He said if I had put it with involuntary servitude I could have gotten it through, or some crime or criminality, such as the peddling of opium, or of vice, in the Philippine Islands. But here is a section that involves everything you can think of, although it mentions no particular subject; and I would like to know why I can not offer it here. We have here a House composed to a great extent of Members from dry States, and is it possible that this House is going on record by saying that it is right to refuse to permit Congress to consider a prohibition amendment as to even the Philippine Islands? I hope that such is not the case. I hope it will not be laid against the record of the gentleman who sits in the chair now that he ruled that as to this proposed section 30 of the Philippine bill it was out of order in this Congress of the United States of America to incorporate a provision denying the peddling of liquor by infamous men in the Philippine Islands, who are debauching the men of those islands with liquor. I hope the Chair will not rule that an amendment restraining those people and putting them out of business is out of order. I hope the Chair will not rule that way. I hope he will never have to explain such a ruling as that to his constituents. I hope that no Member of this House will have to make such an explanation to his constituents. I would not want to go back home and make such an explanation. The laws that are in force over there—and there are any number of them—and the matter of passing such laws or incorporating such laws on the books have been discussed and considered. When we went over there it was said the Filipinos were not in the habit of drinking whisky and alcohol to any great extent.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman is not arguing the point of order but arguing the merits.

Mr. BRYAN. The gentleman from Milwaukee thinks that everything is in order from Milwaukee—

Mr. STAFFORD. Oh, no; I do not hold that everything is in order. I believe we should confine ourselves to the rules of the House.

Mr. BRYAN. I am ready to submit, if the Chair please.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I desire to return to section 18, on page 13. The right to return to that section has been reserved. I desire to move to strike out the word "next," in line 22 of that section, and to insert the word "next" after the word "October," in line 21, so that it will read:

On the 16th day of October next following the election.

Instead of:

On the 16th day of October following the next election.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

Mr. STAFFORD. I understand the unanimous consent is to return to this section merely for the purpose of offering this amendment?

Mr. JONES. That one amendment; yes.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Chairman, when that amendment is offered, I would like also to be permitted to offer this prohibition amendment.

Mr. JONES. Consent was given specifically to offer this amendment and none other.

Mr. BRYAN. Then I will withdraw the proposition so far as that section is concerned.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 13, line 21, after the word "October," insert the word "next." Line 22, after the word "the," strike out the word "next."

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman from Virginia about a cognate matter, possibly?

Mr. BRYAN. Cognac?

Mr. MANN. What is cognac? I know what "cognate" means. I suppose the gentleman from Washington is familiar with the "juice," however. [Laughter.] On page 16, in reference to the election of the Resident Commissioners, was that entirely changed? It is section 20.

Mr. JONES. Leave was given to return to that section. It is on page 17, in section 20.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The amendment was again read.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JONES. Now, Mr. Chairman, I desire to return to page 17, section 20. Permission was given to return to that section for this specific purpose. I desire to strike out the word "twenty-one," which was inserted as an amendment to line 5. The committee amended line 5 by striking out "nineteen" and inserting "twenty-one." I now move to strike out the word "twenty-one" and insert "twenty-two."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 17, line 5, strike out the word "twenty-one" and insert the word "twenty-two."

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman from Virginia if the term has been fixed at six years for the Resident Commissioners?

Mr. JONES. Yes; it has been fixed at six years.

Mr. MANN. Of course the gentleman has had his attention called to the fact that, as the bill read before, there was an interim?

Mr. JONES. Yes. The attention of the Chairman was called to that fact by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD]. We have gone back to correct that. Now, the effect of this amendment is to extend the first term of the Commissioners for about two months. After that it will be six years.

Mr. MANN. May I ask another question? On page 16, line 16, it reads:

Each of said Resident Commissioners shall, in addition to the salary and expenses now allowed by law, be allowed the same sum for stationery and for the pay of necessary clerk hire as is now allowed to the Members of the House of Representatives of the United States.

Has that been changed?

Mr. JONES. That has not been changed.

Mr. MANN. Should not the word "mileage" be inserted before "expenses"?

Mr. JONES. No; because there is a special act which gives the Commissioners \$2,000 in lieu of mileage.

Mr. MANN. I know; so that it would read "mileage expenses." They get a stationery account, and they get clerk hire. You do not want to duplicate that?

Mr. JONES. No; we do not want to duplicate that.

Mr. MANN. It says, "in addition to the salary and expenses now allowed by law," which includes stationery and clerk hire, they shall be allowed "the same sum for stationery and for the pay of necessary clerk hire as is now allowed to the Members of the House of Representatives of the United States." Now, if we should insert, before the word "expenses," the word "mileage," it would read, "in addition to the salary and mileage expenses now allowed by law," and so forth. That would fix it. They should be allowed stationery and clerk hire. Otherwise you duplicate the stationery and mileage account.

Mr. JONES. I do not think it would be proper to put in the word "mileage," because a lump sum is allowed now in lieu of mileage.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I understand; but it is mileage expenses. It would be called "mileage expenses." They are now allowed, as Members of Congress are, mileage expenses, except that there is a fixed sum; and they are also allowed a stationery account and a clerk-hire account. Those expenses they are now allowed.

Mr. JONES. The gentleman is asking unanimous consent, then—

Mr. MANN. No; I was asking if that was inserted.

Mr. JONES. The suggestion of the gentleman is that instead of "expenses" it should read, "the sums now allowed in lieu of mileage." I see no objection to that.

Mr. MANN. Yes; so that it would not duplicate the stationery and clerk-hire account.

Mr. JONES. That is what the word "expenses" was meant to cover. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, then—

Mr. MANN. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY] has another amendment pending.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I desire to oppose the amendment.

A little while ago the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Moore] made a statement which, it appears to me, ought not to be allowed to go unchallenged. His attack on the Democratic Party should be refuted. And inasmuch as no gentleman on that side of the House has seen fit to answer it, I want to call attention to it for just a moment. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Moore] criticizes the Democratic campaign textbook because it does not contain the Baltimore platform.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman is not discussing this amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I hope the gentleman will not do that now for two or three minutes. He will not make progress if he does.

Mr. JONES. I hope the gentleman—

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I will get through in three minutes.

Mr. JONES. The gentleman was frank enough yesterday to ask to be allowed to proceed out of order. I never knew of a gentleman to make a request like that before. Now, he is proceeding to do without permission what he asked permission to do yesterday, when permission was granted.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. If the gentleman will possess his soul in patience for three minutes, I will agree to quit.

Mr. JONES. If the gentleman will agree to quit permanently, all right. [Laughter.]

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Not permanently, so long as you have a Democratic majority here, but only for this time. [Laughter.]

What I wanted to call attention to is this—something which some one on that side ought to have called attention to, but did not—because the criticism of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Moore] was unjust. He criticized the Democratic campaign textbook, because it did not contain the Baltimore platform. How could they have put into that textbook any part of the Democratic platform when there is none left? [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. MOORE. Does not the gentleman know that, in addition to leaving out the Panama Canal plank and the one-term plank for President, they also claim credit for the passage of the seamen's bill? I would like to know when that bill passed.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. The Democratic campaign textbook is just as notable for what it leaves out as for what it puts in. Who would believe a Democratic platform promise, anyway? [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. MOORE. Maybe the Filipinos.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Oh, no. The Filipinos know how other people have been deceived, and instead of taunting them about not putting their platform into their textbook, you ought to compliment them on it. They are trying to forget it. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. MOORE. They used to tell it to the marines, but now they tell it to the Filipinos.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I think I have sufficiently defended these distinguished gentlemen over there; they could not defend themselves. They are all tied to the President. I do not think it is fair for my friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. Moore] to taunt them when they are not in a position to reply.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, may I not reply? A personal attack has been made upon me. I have been accused of defending the Democratic platform. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I must object to any further discussion out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent, on page 16, line 16, to strike out the words "expenses now allowed by law" and insert the words "the sum now allowed in lieu of mileage."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 16, line 16, strike out the words "expenses now allowed by law" and insert in lieu thereof "the sum now allowed in lieu of mileage."

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I suggest to the gentleman that he does not desire to strike out any more than the word "expenses," because "allowed by law" refers back to salary as well as mileage.

Mr. JONES. I think the gentleman is right about that; that was my first thought.

Mr. MILLER. It should read, "in addition to the salary the sum in lieu of mileage now allowed by law."

Mr. JONES. "The sum in lieu of mileage" should be inserted in place of the word "expenses." Mr. Chairman, I ask to modify my amendment so that we strike out the word "expenses" and insert "the sum in lieu of mileage."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 16, line 16, strike out the word "expenses" and insert the words "the sum in lieu of mileage," so that the amended lines will read: "Each of said Resident Commissioners shall, in addition to the salary and the sum in lieu of mileage now allowed by law, be allowed the same sum of stationery," etc.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia asks unanimous consent that the amendment just reported by the Clerk be made. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. The Democratic Party having done so little toward carrying out its platform pledges, they felt it incumbent on them to carry out one promise, and that is the Philippine promise. This is, I assume, on the theory that even if they do not keep faith with the American people they should keep faith with the Filipinos. I do not think, however, that justifies the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY] in defending the writer of the Democratic campaign textbook in all he says. That gentleman charges the administration with being responsible for all the present—

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman from Wyoming is not discussing his amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I was proceeding to discuss the matter that was discussed a moment ago. If the gentleman on the other side will inform me what the last word is, I will discuss that.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. If the gentleman from Wyoming, with all his keen intelligence, has not perception enough to know what the last word is, I shall not inform him. I make the point of order that the gentleman is not discussing the amendment before the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I do not think the administration ought to be charged with all the crime and chaos in Mexico, and that is what their Democratic campaign textbook has charged the administration with.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order again that the gentleman is not discussing the amendment.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, the next thing in order is to return to the preamble in accordance with the ruling of the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there any other part of the bill that was to be returned to?

Mr. JONES. Yes, Mr. Chairman; there is one other item.

Mr. MILLER. I was endeavoring to get recognition for the amendment that I send to the desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 19, line 4, by striking out after the word "law" the remainder of the sentence and inserting a colon and the following: "Provided, That whenever the Governor General shall exercise the authority granted in this section he shall at once notify the President of the United States thereof, together with the attending facts and circumstances, and the President shall have power to modify or vacate the action of the Governor General."

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I do not think there is any objection on this side to that amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JONES. Now, Mr. Chairman, the next thing is to return to the preamble, as I understand the ruling of the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the preamble.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas it was never the intention of the people of the United States in the incipency of the War with Spain to make it a war of conquest or for territorial aggrandizement; and

Whereas it is, as it has always been, the purpose of the people of the United States to withdraw their sovereignty over the Philippine Islands and to recognize their independence as soon as a stable government can be established therein; and

Whereas for the speedy accomplishment of such purpose it is desirable to place in the hands of the people of the Philippines as large a control of their domestic affairs as can be given them without, in the meantime, impairing the exercise of the rights of sovereignty by the people of the United States, in order that, by the use and exercise of popular franchise and governmental powers, they may be the better prepared to fully assume the responsibilities and enjoy all the privileges of complete independence: Therefore—

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Chairman, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, before the amendment is reported I would like to ask the gentleman from Virginia if we can not make some agreement as to the time for discussion of this preamble.

Mr. JONES. I should be very glad to come to some agreement. It is now 10 minutes of 3 o'clock. We want to vote on this bill this evening. I think that was the understanding on yesterday, when the business in order on Wednesday was made in order on Thursday, so that we might be able to complete this bill to-day. We have taken up so much time now in the discussion of amendments that there is not a great deal of time left. What would the gentleman suggest?

Mr. TOWNER. I should think we ought to have on this side one hour. This is the most important thing in the whole bill.

Mr. JONES. That is, two hours' discussion of the preamble and all amendments?

Mr. TOWNER. Yes.

Mr. JONES. That would bring it up to 10 minutes of 5. Then there is to be a half hour of general debate.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I will say to the gentleman that, so far as I am concerned, I am willing to waive that.

Mr. JONES. The gentleman will waive the 15 minutes allotted to his side?

Mr. TOWNER. Yes; on the supposition, of course, that the gentleman will do the same in respect to his side.

Mr. JONES. But I had arranged with a gentleman on this side to occupy those 15 minutes, and, of course, I can not waive that.

Mr. TOWNER. Let the 15 minutes be considered as part of the hour.

Mr. JONES. That the 30 minutes are to be considered a part of the two hours?

Mr. TOWNER. Very well.

Mr. JONES. I do not object to that.

Mr. TOWNER. Will the gentleman submit the request, or shall I?

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the preamble and all amendments thereto be limited to two hours, one half to be controlled by myself and the other half by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER], and that the half hour of general debate which has been agreed to shall be included within the two hours.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia asks unanimous consent that all debate on the preamble and amendments thereto be concluded in two hours, one half to be controlled by himself and the other half to be controlled by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER], and that the half hour of general debate heretofore agreed upon shall be included in the two hours. Is there objection?

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I would like to have some understanding about "where we are at" in this sort of a division. I understand that upon this side the chairman is opposed to any amendments to the preamble, and I do not understand what the position of the gentleman from Iowa is upon that side. I think the time ought to be divided equally in reference to the question at issue. I have no objection to limiting debate to two hours. I think that is longer than is necessary.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I wish to ask the gentleman from Iowa if he would object to so modifying the request which I have made that of these two hours, one half to be taken from the hour controlled by him and the other half to be taken from the hour controlled by myself, the gentleman from Texas be allowed 10 minutes?

Mr. TOWNER. No; we are as much opposed to the gentleman's amendment as the gentleman is. We have already given up 15 minutes of our time.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit the amendment to be reported, and then take up the question of this agreement for time? I have not heard the amendment.

Mr. TOWNER. I have no objection to that.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend by striking out the preamble and inserting the following:

"That it is the purpose of the United States to cease exercising sovereignty over the Philippine Islands as soon as may be with justice to them and honor to the United States, and that it is the preference of the United States to accomplish this purpose by establishing an independent government in said islands; that in pursuance of such purpose and preference the President is respectfully requested to consider the expediency of opening negotiations with the Governments of Great Britain, Germany, France, Russia, Spain, and such other Governments as he may think advisable, with a view of effecting a joint treaty with such Governments, by which it shall be provided that an independent government in the Philippine Islands, when established by the United States, shall be recognized and preserved; that pending the establishment of such independent Philippine government the Philippine Islands shall be neutral territory; that such Philippine government, when established, shall agree that it will maintain equality of trade relations toward all the signatory powers, and that in the event of war between any of the nations of the earth it shall be neutral; that such concessions as may be made by the United States in the establishment of such independent government shall be recognized by all the signatory powers."

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order, first, that that exact proposition has been voted upon, and, second, that it is not germane to the preamble. I reserve the point of order.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Chairman, I would rather the gentleman would make the point of order now.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Then, Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order.

Mr. BURGESS. Then we will have a brief discussion of it at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Chairman, I am not much of a parliamentarian, but I take it that there are others here who are. I call attention to what Mr. Speaker CLARK said on October 2, 1914, in the discussion of this very matter. He then said:

If the gentleman will permit, of course I do not know the exact processes of the mind of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURGESS], although I am remarkably well acquainted with him; but I take it that the reason he offered his resolution as section 14 to this bill is that under parliamentary practice we do not get to the preamble until we get through with the bill. My own judgment about it is that as a parliamentary proposition it would come in as a substitute for the preamble; but it would be like locking the barn door after the horse is gone; and the gentleman has given notice that he proposes to strike out the preamble if his amendment goes in. So that it is practically offered as a substitute for the preamble.

I submit that in the absence of any authority or any pretense of any, that is the highest authority that we have in this House—the Speaker's own words. Further than that, to take a general and common-sense view of the situation, this resolution of mine which I have offered as an amendment to the preamble is so worded and framed as to come in line with the original preamble. The thing about it is that it goes further; that it does direct the President to enter into negotiations. That ought to be done. If it can be done in this way, what is the objection to it? I submit when I offered this as an amendment to the bill they made the point of order to that.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Oh, I beg the gentleman's pardon. No point of order was made.

Mr. BURGESS. Oh, I beg the gentleman's pardon. A point of order was made and it was overruled. Then, when it is offered to amend the preamble, it is said that there is no place for it in the bill. Mr. Chairman, this is a bill dealing with the Philippine question, and it deals broadly with it, and I think, although I am no parliamentarian and do not set myself up as such, it is clearly in order.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I simply call the attention of the Chair, first, to the fact that the precise proposition which the gentleman now offers was offered as an amendment to the bill. The precise proposition in the precise language was voted down. It has therefore been disposed of, and the effort of the gentleman now is to get a vote upon that which has already been disposed of and settled. The second point of my parliamentary contention is that it is not germane to the preamble. A preamble, Mr. Chairman, is nothing but a recitation of facts or supposed facts. We do not put into a preamble a direction to anybody to do anything. See how this would read if the amendment of the gentleman from Texas were to prevail—to strike out the preamble and insert in lieu thereof

the resolution which he has sent to the Clerk's desk, and before the enacting clause. It contains no recitation of facts—

Mr. BURGESS. The gentleman is mistaken about that; it begins by declaring the purpose of the United States.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. All right; I admit that. It does contain a specific direction to the President that he shall do a particular thing. Is it possible for any gentleman to conceive of putting into the preamble of a bill, or even a resolution, before the enacting clause, a proposition directing the President or anybody else to take a certain course? The preamble recites the facts. Directions must be contained in the enacting or resolving clause of the bill or resolution, as the case may be. With all possible respect, Mr. Chairman, if the amendment of the gentleman from Texas were to prevail and this preamble were to be stricken out and the resolution which he has sent to the desk be substituted in its place, it would leave this bill in the most peculiar shape grammatically, legislatively, and rhetorically that any bill was ever left in in the history of any legislative body in the world. Upon these two points I insist upon the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas care to be heard further?

Mr. BURGESS. No; I do not think so.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is of the opinion that, in view of the fact that this identical proposition has already been presented to the committee and been disposed of in the form in which it is now offered, it would not be proper to offer it as a substitute for the preamble. Furthermore, the Chair does not believe it is germane to the preamble, and for these reasons the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. BURGESS. The Chair will note that I take exception to the Chair's ruling.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I now renew my request.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, may I inquire of the gentleman from Virginia what the status of amendments which some gentlemen may propose would be?

Mr. JONES. They would all have to be offered within the two hours.

Mr. MILLER. And then voted upon one after the other at the conclusion of general debate?

Mr. JONES. They would have to be voted upon during the two hours, I think. The request I made was that this preamble and all amendments that might be offered to it should be disposed of within two hours.

Mr. MILLER. Then, if I understand the gentleman, it is his intention that a Member who speaks in his time will offer such amendment or amendments as he desires, and at the conclusion of his remarks the amendment or amendments which he has offered will be voted upon.

Mr. JONES. That will be all right.

Mr. MILLER. I have no objection just so it is understood.

Mr. JONES. With the understanding, I have no objection; that they be voted upon at the conclusion of the debate.

Mr. MILLER. It is understood the time that may be occupied in voting upon an amendment will not be taken out of the two hours.

Mr. JONES. Yes.

Mr. MILLER. I do not presume much time will be occupied.

Mr. JONES. There will be two hours of general debate, and then the amendments will be voted on, but there will be no debate after the two hours.

Mr. MILLER. I understand.

Mr. JONES. The gentleman from Minnesota will understand that all debate, so to speak, must be embraced within the two hours.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia asks unanimous consent that all debate upon the preamble close in two hours, one half of that time to be controlled by himself and the other half by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER], and at the end of that time the amendments offered shall be voted upon, and that the 30 minutes of general debate included in a former agreement shall be included in the two hours. Is there objection?

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I desire to ask the gentleman from Virginia if he thinks two hours, one hour to a side, is enough for the discussion of a subject of such tremendous importance as this?

Mr. JONES. It would not be if we had not already devoted 7½ hours to discussion of this subject. As I stated a few moments ago, we are very anxious to get through with this matter this evening, and probably there will be an aye and no vote in the House that will run way after 6 o'clock.

Mr. COOPER. The gentleman from Virginia will remember that the issue was not made until the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] declared that he was opposed to the United States

ever relinquishing control over the Philippine Islands, which injected a new issue, one unknown to the politics of this country, I think. I never heard of it being stated by one so prominent.

Mr. MANN. Well, Mr. Chairman, the debate went on for several hours after that, and I really think two hours' debate on the preamble is a very liberal allowance of time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. BUTLER. Reserving the right to object, if the gentleman will permit, is it contemplated having a vote on the bill this evening?

Mr. JONES. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object—

Mr. REILLY of Connecticut. It is too late.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee (continuing). Do I understand the agreement was to close debate and then have the amendments voted on?

The CHAIRMAN. The agreement was to close all debate on the preamble and amendments thereto in two hours. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the hour on this side.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I am emphatically opposed to the preamble, to every paragraph of it, and to every line in it; but I assume that there may be a desire upon the part of the majority, who have the preponderance of votes in the committee, to maintain the preamble in the bill, and therefore I have three amendments which I desire to offer. The first amendment is to insert after the word "stable" in the second paragraph of the preamble the word "representative." The second amendment is to insert in the same line after the word "established" the two words "and maintained."

The third amendment which I desire to offer is as follows, to follow the second paragraph:

Provided, That the people of the Philippine Islands shall desire their independence, expressed by a majority vote of the qualified electors at the general election held next after it shall be decided that suitable government can be established.

Directing our attention first to the preamble as a whole, I think this is one of the most remarkable features of any bill that has ever been presented for the consideration of the Congress. It is to be noted, as has been stated many times before, that this is not a part of the bill. It is simply a gratuitous statement. It is not a promise; it is not an assurance. It simply says it has always been the intention of the people of the United States to give to the Philippine Islands independence. When? When a suitable government can be established therein. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that this is not a provision aimed for the welfare of the people of those islands, but a provision in the nature of playing party politics within the United States. In the Democratic platform language something like this is used—but no more futile language touching a great matter was ever employed—"as soon as a stable government can be established."

Mr. Chairman, to-day there is a stable government in the islands. Nay, more; there has been a stable government in the islands at least during the past 13 years. If, therefore, our guide is to be when a stable government can be established, the time for their independence is now, and any bill short of that is pure buncombe and an attempt to mislead and hoodwink rather than an attempt to carry out a policy.

But, Mr. Chairman, if it be contended that it means as soon as a stable government can be established by the Filipinos, we still have a matter that needs further elucidation. The Philippine people can establish a stable government to-day. It would not be a representative government; it would not be a republican form of government, as we understand it, but it would be a stable government. I believe that they could establish tomorrow a limited monarchy, and that government would be reasonably efficient and reasonably well maintained. It, therefore, is the intention of the people of the United States to give to these people independence as soon as they can establish a government, that certainly comprehends a limited monarchy. But if it is the intention only to give them their independence when a representative government can be established and maintained by them, then let us write it in the bill. But above all, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that we should consider the people of the islands. It seems to me that we should be guided by considerations of their wishes and their welfare rather than attempt to play party politics within the United States.

Do the people of the Philippine Islands to-day want immediate independence? No; they do not. Will they want it 10 years from now? I do not know and you do not know. I do not believe they will. But above all things we should give

them the right to say whether they prefer to establish a government of their own by themselves or whether they prefer to remain beneath the American flag. [Applause on the Republican side.]

If it is the intent of Democracy to scuttle the ship, if it be the intent of Democracy to haul down the flag and withdraw our frontiers to our own shores, regardless of what may be the desire of that people or what may happen to them, then adopt the preamble. But if you are actuated by more humanitarian motives, if you have in your hearts altruistic designs, you will never adopt this preamble in its present form. I believe that in this bill and in this preamble there is an open confession of two things, namely, that the whole Democratic policy toward the Philippine Islands from 1900 until now has been wrong; that the whole policy of the Republican Party during that time has been right [applause on the Republican side]; that the Philippine people during that period of time at no moment have been capable of maintaining self-government and independence. Nay, more, that even after 14 years of the best instruction that a human soul ever had in government they are to-day still incapable of establishing and maintaining a government under independence. When will the time come? Nobody knows.

Therefore my second proposition is that this sounds the death knell of independence to the islands, at least during any period of time reasonable for us to consider. I am firmly of the opinion that the people of the Philippine Islands, having before their minds the historic events of the past 60 days, are trembling for fear you will haul down the American flag. Only on yesterday I received an account of an article in a native paper published in the islands that heretofore has been most extravagant in its requests for independence containing this remarkable confession:

We now see after what has happened to Belgium, after what has happened to Luxemburg, after what we behold in various parts of the world, that the Philippine Islands need the United States now more than the United States needs the Philippine Islands.

[Applause on the Republican side.]

That sentiment is going to grow. I believe the political thought of the islands is bound to turn more and more away from independence to the industrial development of their resources.

While this bill and this preamble clearly indicate a new Democratic policy, one that in no sense contemplates independence of the islands for at least a great many years to come, yet in the passage of the preamble I can see a source of real trouble. To the Filipino mind the existence of this preamble will likely be taken to mean independence within a year or two, ever near at hand, and the scheming politician can easily foment agitation. As long as independence is not to be granted at any time possible now even to guess, it is the height of folly to place this preamble here.

It certainly is highly improper for a nation to say now what in the future it will do, especially in relation to its sovereignty. To do so is far from a statesmanlike course. To do so is to create embarrassments and difficulties for the future. In years to come it may be preeminently desired, for a thousand reasons, both by the people of the islands and by the people of the United States, that the Philippine Archipelago remain a part of the United States. Why bind the future by unnecessary statements now? Why blindly declare the course of our conduct in the future without knowing what the future will bring forth? Will gentlemen insist at some future date to withdraw our sovereignty from the islands, even though the people of the islands beg and pray for it to remain? Are gentlemen so bent on partisanship that they are deaf alike to their Nation's honor and the call of humanity?

Mr. Chairman, the roll is soon to be called upon the passage of the bill. If this preamble be eliminated, I am inclined to vote for the measure, but if retained, I must oppose the whole.

While I say I would support the bill divested of the preamble, I do not wish it to be understood that I believe in all the features it contains. The best part of the bill—probably its largest part, as well—consists in its grant to the Filipinos of a complete legislature elected by them. I congratulate the framers of the measure for having adopted the one great recommendation I made, now almost a year ago, after my tour through the islands. I then said, as I have since many times repeated, that the Filipinos should have the full power to choose their own legislature, the full power to legislate for themselves, subject only to the check and restraint from an absolute veto. The absolute veto was at first criticized, but that principle has been made a part of the bill. I believe the people there will make reasonably wise use of this grant of legislative power, and, besides, its exercise will greatly train them in the business of government.

I am for the bill as a whole because it is up now for action, although I think its enactment now is premature. As long as the government in the islands is to be remodeled, let us do a good job of it—give to the Filipinos the fullest measure of power and see what use they make of it. Let them have a full and a fair chance to demonstrate what they can do. It would have been wise, in my opinion, if this complete reorganization of the government had been considerably postponed, but the intent is to reorganize now, and in the consideration of the bill I have sincerely tried to perfect it.

But let no one be deceived. In many ways this bill gives too suddenly power that should be acquired gradually. The enactment of this bill into law will inevitably decrease very materially the efficiency of the government in the islands. We have heard blind prejudice criticize and narrow partisanship malign the government hitherto maintained in the islands since they came beneath our flag, and yet the truth is, the truth a wiser world in the passage of time will recognize, is that in these far-away islands the Americans have established and maintained a better government than they have provided for themselves anywhere within the confines of the United States.

Under the provision extending the franchise, elections will likely present a sad and heartbreaking spectacle. But out of this slough the people will gradually climb. I hope they will rapidly overcome the election difficulties with which they will at first be embarrassed.

Then, too, the splendid work already well advanced among the non-Christian tribes will be materially halted. The method of handling the wild-tribe problem provided for in the bill will inevitably lead to many difficulties from which the wild man will surely suffer. A million of these people trustingly look to the United States as their great friend here on earth. I sincerely hope the Filipinos will measure up to the duty incumbent upon them, realize the responsibility now largely shifted to them, and by wise as well as generous conduct demonstrate that they are the brothers of these untutored savages.

I have great faith in the Filipino people. I want them to develop a distinct nationality and make their contribution to the advancement of human kind. The opportunity is before them. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

[Mr. COOPER addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

The CHAIRMAN. If there is no further debate on this preamble—

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes' time to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL].

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I want to suggest to the gentleman from Iowa that amendments ought to be offered or be considered pending, because we have to vote on them as soon as this debate is concluded.

Mr. TOWNER. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER] has offered his amendments.

Mr. MANN. No; he did not offer them.

Mr. JONES. I understood that he indicated that he would offer them.

Mr. MANN. That will be done right away.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] is recognized.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, in the opening of the debate, or rather at the close of the opening debate on this bill, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. JONES] referred to the fact that most of the discussion had been not on the bill but on the preamble. That was not extraordinary, as the gentleman should have realized, and possibly did.

Whether this declaration in the form of a preamble is the fruit of the settled conviction of a great party or is simply a piece of cheap political buncombe, in any event it is the thunder in the prelude that overshadows and colors all that follows. These people over yonder are not children. They can recognize a good thing in a political gift without having it sugar-coated by something that we may not be able to live up to and that they may never desire that we shall live up to.

Many of the provisions of this bill are good. I think that I should be willing to vote for all of its provisions if it were not for this misleading, unwise, unnecessary preamble. We are not in the Philippines and we never have been there for any purpose of exploitation. There is not a man under the flag that has ever had any other notion, no matter what party he belongs to, except that we have a great duty to perform over there.

I do not think the American people believe, or will believe, that duty can be performed by any policy of scuttle and surrender of our responsibilities. I look forward to the time when the Filipino people, having advanced in their knowledge of

representative government, will realize how helpful it is to them, will realize how useful it is to them, ay, when they will take pride, as I think they now do, in the fact that they are politically united with the greatest Commonwealth of all time, as the eloquent representative of that people referred to the United States the other day.

Our relations with these people have been inspiring to us. They have been helpful to them. Never in history have any people advanced as these people have advanced with our aid and with our assistance and guidance. The future does not present to me any picture of our surrender of responsibility and the ultimate gobbling up of those islands by some oriental despotism. It presents to me an inspiring view of advancement, of enlightenment, of progress, under the guiding hand and strong protection of this great Republic, a view which in the days to come the people of the Philippine Islands will applaud as fully as our own people. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Our acts and attitude toward these people must primarily be based on our opinion of what they desire and what is for their best interest. I would no more declare that it is our intention to hold the islands permanently than I would declare it is our intention to let them go. The future must decide that, and it will be decided in view of what those people may desire when the time arrives when they may be able to stand alone. For the present let us give them every particle of self-government they can wisely use and administer, and let the future decide what it is wise to do when the time for such a decision may arrive. Liberty and good government are what the people want. They can have it as well, and for the present at least better, united with us than as an independent government.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to my colleague on the committee [Mr. HELM].

Mr. HELM. Mr. Chairman, this preamble that has been so much criticized by gentlemen on the Republican side of the Chamber is the will and testament of the Democratic Party to the Philippine people.

Contrast the actions of the present Democratic Governor General, the policy of the Democratic Party as announced in the preamble, and the liberal provisions of this bill with the course pursued when the Republican Party was in power; when you, by inexcusable and unjustifiable war, subjugated these people, and now call it a blessing. As well should the Belgian people to-day return thanks and offer up their benedictions to the force, the overpowering force, that has desolated that country, as did the overpowering force of the United States subdue the Filipinos.

You made an unforgivable war on a people who had allied themselves with the American forces to drive out a people that were misgoverning these islands. You turned upon your allies and waged war upon them, and now take the position that you have conferred a blessing upon the people upon whom you have made an unpardonable war. The same subtle and promoting influences that were then at work reassert and disclose themselves here again when the leader of the Republican Party [Mr. MANN] but a few days ago said that we want to hold these islands on account of an inevitable war that he foresaw, and cited the fact that the colonies were coming to the assistance and aid of England; so would the Philippine Islands come to our rescue in time of like distress. Unwittingly he has raised the curtain and disclosed the real motive of the military party that was behind the McKinley administration which involved the United States in the Philippine Islands, and now insists on their retention.

Imperialism as against democracy! If we need these islands for war purpose, the argument of the gentleman from Illinois would say, "Give us other colonies for like uses and purposes as England has them." Imperialism in its worst form! Of what aid would England's colonies now be to her without her command of the sea? If we are going to embark in this war game and colonial policy, we need a Navy that will be as much greater than England as England and her allies now are to Germany; a standing Army stronger and more efficient than Germany's. How long will this Republic last after this war-like policy has been established? As between the two pictures, the Democratic Party presents this bill, working back as rapidly and as safely as it can to give these people the management and control of their own affairs, and in due season their independence.

This is the first time that a government that has by conquest acquired sovereignty over the territory of another nation or race of people declares by its official and only mouthpiece that it proposes to voluntarily surrender that sovereignty over the country that it had acquired by conquest. Search the annals of history and where will you find a nation or country that has acquired another territory, described, as are the Philippine Islands, as of boundless resources, of wonderful fertility—where can you

show me a like instance that that Government has freely and voluntarily given back to the people the control of the government and the sovereignty that it took away by force? [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY].

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I listened with some degree of emotion to the distinguished gentleman who has just spoken [Mr. HELM]. He calls this declaration in the preamble the Democratic will and testament to the Philippines. I was aware of the fact that the Democratic Party was sick, but I did not know that it had reached that stage where it thought it was necessary to make its will. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

But it soon would be dead if the people of this country believed that the Democratic Party stood for the doctrine that was preached by the gentleman from Kentucky who has just taken his seat. In my judgment, that was a speech more to be condemned than any that I have heard made upon this question. When he rails against his own country for going into the Philippines, he is welcome to any credit that he can bring to himself or the Democratic Party. Such harangues will find no response from the American people.

My objection to this preamble is largely because of the fact that it does not state any position on account of its duplicity. It is drawn so as to make the Filipinos believe that we want to give them independence, and to make the American people believe that we do not. That part of the preamble in which it says—

Whereas it is, as it has always been, the purpose of the people of the United States to withdraw their sovereignty over the Philippine Islands and to recognize their independence as soon as a stable government can be established therein—

I take issue with as to the fact.

What party declared for it except the Democratic Party, and when did the Democratic Party and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER] become a majority of the people of the United States, or have a right to speak for a majority on questions of that character? The Republican Party never so declared, and the Progressive Party never so declared, and that other platform that was drawn at Chicago by the Roosevelt forces when they thought he was going to be nominated had this declaration in regard to the Philippines:

We pledge the Republican Party to complete the work of preparing the Philippine Islands for self-government under the American flag.

No party except the Democratic Party has ever declared for independence. No party except the Democratic Party, and no man, so far as I know, except the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. HELM], has ever thought that the Stars and Stripes brought an injury to any country. Only once before in the history of this Nation did we ever haul down the flag, and we have been ashamed of it ever since, and we should be. That act, under a former administration, a Democratic one, of course, forever discredited us in the eyes of the world.

I do not believe the Filipinos wish independence. Those who think they will govern do; those that will be governed do not. I believe that when the Filipinos are sufficiently intelligent to govern themselves they will be sufficiently intelligent to appreciate the advantages of remaining under our flag. Wherever the Stars and Stripes have gone they have brought good, and they will bring only good to the Philippine Islands. For one, I am opposed to the cowardly proposition to turn these islands loose, to become a prey of the other nations of the world. Such act would cause us forever to be despised by all right-thinking men. To give them independence and then agree to protect them from their own folly and the strong nations of the world would be dangerous to us and ruinous to them. If the time ever comes when we grant independence to the Philippines, then let it be complete and unconditional. We did not go in there of our own volition, but we would be untrue to our trust and untrue to civilization and untrue to ourselves to turn those islands loose under any conditions whatsoever. [Applause on the Republican side.]

I agree with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] that we should not think of granting independence to the Philippines at this time, and I do not believe the time will ever come when we could. I agree with him that our highest duty is to give them fullest liberty and make them our friends. Talk of independence now can only do harm and hold out hope to the Filipino people that will not be realized. The Democratic Party will talk independence for political purposes, but they will never vote it for the same reason. It is perfectly safe for the Democratic Party to promise that they will grant independence when "a stable government is established." Behind

that phrase the Democratic Party can dodge and hide as long as they will. Such promise is nothing but a delusion and a snare to the Filipino people. Such promise is intended to mislead the people of the Philippines. The youngest of those now in the islands will not live to see the fulfillment of that Democratic promise, nor any real attempt to fulfill it.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GRAY].

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, several years ago, in reading the debates in Congress, I observed the statement of one of those who spoke for the policy of benevolent assimilation in the Senate, and I well remember his words. He said there were mountains of gold in the Philippines, and that they were ours forever! I am glad that I have an opportunity to participate in erasing the stain of that declaration from this Nation.

Mr. Chairman, they tell us that we are holding the Philippines for their own good and not ours. This plea of benevolence for others is a subterfuge as old as history. Every man who has enslaved another man has enslaved him under the claim that it was for the benefit of the slave. Every nation that has conquered and subjugated a defenseless people has conquered them under the claim that it was for the benefit of the subjugated. Every burden and iniquity that has been heaped upon the weak by the strong has been under the claim that it was for the benefit of the weak. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

And the claim made here is only a repetition in history, when they tell us now that the Filipinos do not desire independence. It is only following in line with a policy of justification as old as the rule of force and might, and it has ever been thus. The slaves have never desired their liberty if we are to take the word of the slaveholder. The conquered have never desired their freedom if we are to take the word of the conqueror. They have always asked for their own slavery and subjugation and a continuance of their thralldom and their captive state. Such has ever been the claim of the disciples of benevolent assimilation. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

It is a matter of history that when we acquired the Philippine Islands the life of Washington and the history of the American Revolution were found scattered broadcast over those islands. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Following in our example, they, too, were dreaming of liberty and independence, but, alas, only to awake in the grasp of a phantom they were following for deliverance. I believe that liberty and self-government can be better taught by example than by conquest and subjugation; that men will follow with glad hearts where they will resent force and coercion. The mission of this Government is not conquest and subjugation. It is to preserve the principles of self-government at home and promote popular rule abroad. That is our mission, and it is a great and glorious mission.

Mr. Chairman, it is true that some men are wiser than other men; it is true that some men are more intelligent than other men; it is true that some men have a greater fund of information in store than other men; but no man is so much wiser, or so much more intelligent, or in possession of so much greater store of information than other men, that he is entitled to tell another man what that other man likes, or what is good for him, or how he should live or love or worship, or to govern him against his will and consent.

The eloquent pleas, the brilliant advocacy, and the tireless activity of the Commissioner from the Philippines [Mr. QUEZON] for the independence of those islands is a full, complete denial, a conclusive rejection and disapproval of this subterfuge and transparent apology for holding these people against their will and consent on the ground that they are incapable of self-government and are not asking for a government of their own.

But our retention of these islands is not only in violation of inalienable human rights and in disregard of the fundamental principles of our institutions, but it is and will be a continuing drain upon our Treasury, a menace to our peace among the nations, and a jeopardy to our security and very national existence. In case of war, these far-away islands in the Tropics, 10,000 miles across the sea, could only be defended, if defense was possible, at an appalling cost in treasure and an awful sacrifice of the lives of our citizens.

And if it was justifiable for us to withhold liberty from these people on the ground of their own well-being, we are precluded from such denial to them by our solemn vows before the world in matters of human rights and by deeds of our forefathers, who consecrated their lives to the principle that all just powers of government are derived from the consent of the governed. We are precluded by our declaration of the rights of men, which we read in the indelible hues of the Stars and Stripes waving from every flagstaff on land and unfolding from every masthead on the sea, in the great Dome of this Capitol, lifting the sym-

bol of our devotion heavenward, in the Monument to Washington, standing out in its dizzy heights against the sky, and in the hearts of 90,000,000 of people, throbbing with the pride and honor of their own freedom and independence before the world. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. BRYAN].

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Chairman, during this Congress I have taken great pleasure in voting on pretty nearly all of the great administration measures with the President of the United States, and I am glad I did so; and if I had the whole thing to do over again, I would vote the same way. [Applause on the Democratic side.] But I would not vote for this preamble to this Philippine bill. I would prefer to change my vote on any measure that I have voted on in this Congress than to vote favorably on this Philippine preamble. I think it is wrong in principle. I believe that it is violative of the very purposes that the Government should have in mind in developing its policy in the Pacific Ocean. Aside from the fact that it will disturb conditions over there and make those people uncertain, if it were binding upon us, it would commit us to a policy that is likely to be destructive of ourselves and of our own rights. Why was it that we took the Philippine Islands? The gentleman just spoke of history and what history said about it. I suppose you will accept Woodrow Wilson as a good authority on history, and you will accept his chronicles as those of an impartial historian. Here is what he said was the reason why President McKinley favored the taking of the Philippine Islands and why they were taken; I quote from his book on Epochs of American History, page 344:

One of the principal reasons that President McKinley had in mind for demanding the Philippines was furnished by the fact that at this time the Empire of China seemed to be tottering to its fall and that the powers of Europe were even then parceling out the prospective spoils. We already had considerable trade interests with the Orient, and the President was persuaded that these might be largely increased if we could but acquire a vestibule thereto somewhat similar to that which England had had at Hongkong for years or that which Germany had just acquired at Kiaochow. But the Philippines once acquired, the very example which had suggested their acquisition seemed now of dangerous import for American interests. For if, in addition to obtaining naval stations and ports of entry to the Chinese Empire, the powers of Europe should proceed to partition its whole vast area and population among themselves, the next step would naturally be the exclusion by each of all others from its respective allotment, and the upshot of the matter would be that the United States would find itself possessed of the Philippines, indeed, but, so far as Chinese trade was concerned, more entirely out in the cold than ever. In brief, the acquisition of the Philippines carried with it as a corollary American championship of the integrity of China and of the "open door" to Chinese trade.

The taking of the islands was popular. The American people backed it up, and, as all will remember, when the treaty came up for approval and it took two-thirds in the United States Senate to approve it, and they lacked two or three votes, Mr. William Jennings Bryan came across the country as the representative of Democracy at the time and urged the adoption of the treaty, and the treaty was adopted.

Mr. Chairman, there is a race issue in the Pacific Ocean beside which the race issue of the South pales into insignificance. The Japanese possess intelligence, they possess ingenuity, they possess ability in all lines that the Negro race never dreamed of and never will dream of if this world lasts for a million years. I want us to live at peace with Japan, and I believe we can do that very thing if we follow the chart that nature and destiny has marked out for us and refuse to falter and waver. If we let the world know that we have a policy and that we will live up to it, there will be no trouble. But those people on the Pacific Ocean are confronting us, they are confronting the white race on the Pacific Ocean, and we are compelled to maintain that we have the right to restrict their immigration into our country. We claim that we have the right to limit or exclude them, and at the same time we have the right to the trade of the Orient—

Mr. SLAYDEN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BRYAN. Make it short; I have only five minutes.

Mr. SLAYDEN. If we have the right to keep them from coming into this country, then have not they the equal moral right to keep us from going into their country?

Mr. BRYAN. If the gentleman believes that he would not be taken as a patriot on the Pacific coast. He would not be recognized as a patriot on the Pacific coast if he takes the position that we have not the right to shut the yellow race out from our country any more than they have the right to shut out our trade and ships of commerce. We let them come here to trade, but we can not attempt to amalgamate with them.

Harper's Weekly of June, 1913, tells in a dramatic way of a short speech of a farmer member of the California Legislature that silenced all opposition to the alien land bill and insured

its passage despite the protests and the pleas of the President and the Secretary of State.

My neighbor is a Jap—

Said the farmer member—

and he has an 80-acre fruit farm next to mine. He is smart and industrious, and I do not dislike him. He has a white woman living in his house. On that white woman's knee is a baby. Now, what is that baby? Is it white? Is it Japanese? I will tell you what it is. It is the beginning of the biggest race problem that the world has ever known.

The bureau of vital statistics of Sacramento, Col., in the year ending May, 1913, recorded 276 births of all nationalities. Of these 107 were Japanese, and half of that number were born of white mothers and Japanese fathers.

Lucile F. Dawson, who has resided in Japan for some years and made a close study of Japanese and oriental problems, writing for the Square Deal for October, has this to say:

In Tokyo, Yokohama, and Nagasaki, where the largest number of English-speaking people reside, there have been several of these international marriages, and in almost every instance the children of such unions have been degenerates. A Japanese teacher in an American school at Nagasaki is authority for this statement. She further said that upon investigation as to the cause of this degeneracy they found in every case both parents to be of the better class of Japanese and Occidental. Few of the European or American men intermarry with the Japanese women, but a great many white women marry Japanese men of the noble and Heimen classes. This latter class is between the classes we have in the United States and the nobility and are just as exclusive as the latter. It was this class whose courage, valor, and devotion to Japan were so admirably displayed during the Chinese and Russian wars. Yet, with some of the best blood of the Anglo-Saxon race and the healthiest and best of Japanese blood in their veins, American school statistics in Japan show these children to be not only backward but physically degenerate.

Another reason why the Japanese are so desirous of intermarrying with the better class of Caucasians is because of the physical inferiority of the Japanese people. Centuries of isolation, the exclusive use of vegetable food, climatic conditions, and intermarriage have had the effect of bringing about a lack of physical vigor and a race of small-statured people, a well-defined difference which characterizes the Anglo-Saxon, Celtic, and Teutonic races, a difference the ambitious Japanese is keenly cognizant of. And they are just as ambitious to remove this badge of inferiority from their race as they are to excel in warrior prowess.

Except England, there is no nation as aristocratic as Japan. From its first era there has been great distinction between the noble and ignoble classes, a condition which occidental influences have been unable to entirely eradicate, and which is as strong in the heart of the Yeta as it is in the heart of the great nobles. All classes point with pride to the fact that Japan is the only nation where the reigning imperial family has descended from time immemorial to the present, in one unbroken line of succession, the present Emperor being the one hundred and twenty-second of the imperial line.

They will tell you with pride what great statesmen they are and that as yet they have never been conquered by any other nation and, furthermore, they never will be. As we are the youngest nation in the world they will explain how impossible it is for Americans to be their superior, and how inferior our form of government is to theirs. The very lowest caste Japanese considers himself the superior of any American, and American customs, religions, and ideas of morality are far inferior to those of Japan, according to the Japanese lights.

It is to be hoped that we will never have war with Japan or China or with any other power concerning our Pacific interests. But our possessions in the Pacific exclusive of the Philippines have forced upon us certain obligations to which we must be faithful. The climax of our entire scheme in the Pacific is the open door in China. We stand for the territorial integrity of China and for the absolute freedom of all nations to trade in China on an equal basis. This policy is so fair and reasonable that we have been able to enforce it heretofore through diplomacy. Every step of history seems to accord with this policy. England is compelled to favor it, and it seems now that Germany is to be converted to it, and very likely Germany, after the termination of the present war, will be one of the strongest supporters of the policy. Japan may chafe some under the enforcement of the open door at times, but it almost seems that

That increasing purpose which through the ages runs

is with us in the enforcement of the open door in China. The Commonwealth of Australia, the Dominion of New Zealand, and the Dominion of Canada stand as controlling factors so far as the policy of England is concerned. These dependencies of England, which are practically free and independent Governments, will always support us in this open-door policy and in the maintenance of Caucasian authority in the Pacific. The instant that proposition is challenged by Japan, that instant the alliance between England and Japan must fall, or Canada, Australia, and New Zealand will turn against their mother country and stand with us. It seems that the God of Nations has willed it this way, has carved out this destiny for us, and put us in a position where we can stand for the highest ideals of altruism in our dealings with China and Japan and the Philippines, and yet can work out our own destiny and aid in fulfilling the most worthy and the sincerest ambitions and longings of the race, as well as promote stability and insure peace.

We are a peace-loving people. We do not care to emigrate to Japan or China, either, if they do not want us there. We

do not want to own land in Japan. We do not want to crowd Japanese schools with American children and young men. We do not shut our doors to Japanese trade. We have a good friend in China, and our position as to the open-door policy and the preservation of the integrity of China insures a lasting friendship. By maintaining our position in the Philippines we can meet the falsehoods that may be circulated; we can demonstrate our American character to the orientals. I think it an awful mistake to throw hindrances in the way by lauding the Aguinaldos as the George Washingtons of the islands, by encouraging insurrection and discontent by titles to acts and by silly and vain preambles. Such procedure is little short of shameful.

JEALOUS NATIONS TRIED TO ELIMINATE US.

It has been said that we acquired the Philippines and paid \$20,000,000 for them because Germany was negotiating with Spain for them. I do not know whether that is true or not, but if it was true, I think it was sufficient reason for us to close the bargain and not allow Germany to get that foothold in the Pacific under conditions that then existed. I am very much inclined to give credence to the report. Here is a statement that has an indirect bearing on the subject, made by Woodrow Wilson in Epochs of American History, page 344. After writing of European jealousies against us in the Spanish-American War, the author says:

It failed, but the jealousy that underlay it found expression now and then in more petty ways. In Manila Bay, for example, Admiral Diederichs, of the German squadron, which had been dispatched thither after Dewey's victory for no adequate reason at all, became so officious that Dewey offered him "a fight if he wanted it," with the result of bringing such annoyances to an end.

Mr. Chairman, every man worthy of a seat in this House has his own individual views on the great economic, moral, and industrial questions of the day. I was brought up in the State of Louisiana and was taught Democracy as one of the fundamentals; yet as I came to manhood and paid closer attention to political arguments and party pretensions I observed that Democracy in Louisiana involved mainly a race issue and pride of southern history. I was not wanting in loyalty on either of these scores. But I also observed that on the great economic questions on which the parties differed the leading Louisiana Democrats were just as much Republican as they were Democrat. They were protectionists in so far as the tariff involved the customs rates on sugar, lumber, and rice. No Payne or Aldrich could put too much tariff on either of these products to suit these Louisiana Democrats. On labor issues, on money legislation, the Louisiana Senators and Members of Congress in that long-ago day were as standpoint as Wall Street or the "infant industries" would have them.

After three years of Theodore Roosevelt as President I emigrated to the State of Washington. On the "paramount issue" of imperialism I had been dubbed Republican by one of my best friends, who is now one of the leaders of the party in the State of Louisiana, and when I landed on Puget Sound I was easily enthused on the destiny of America in the Pacific and the Orient. I gloried in the plans for extension of American influence in the Far East. Parker was running against Roosevelt, and the Democrats were holding their noses and voting for Parker. I at once became a Roosevelt supporter.

One of the main features that controlled my views at that time was the straightforward plans of Theodore Roosevelt and his advisers to take care of American interests and the interests of the Caucasian race in the Pacific. I had been brought up with a race issue dinning in my ears, and so I readily adapted my views to this new race issue. I believed in the expansion of trade and the extension of influence in the Pacific. The people of the country voted against a retreat from our position in the Pacific, and the people to-day are of the same opinion. Nobody knows any better than the Democratic leaders that the people of this country do not want this Nation committed to a policy of retreat and backdown in the Pacific, and so they come here in the face of the Democratic platform and are expecting to force through this House as a lame compliance with a platform pledge this title and preamble to their Philippine bill, which will be no part of the bill and will have no separate existence and will therefore be nothing.

The bill starts out with a falsehood and an attempt at deception when it is presented to Congress and to all who may read it hereafter with these words of introduction which compose its title:

A bill to declare the purpose of the people of the United States as to the future political status of the people of the Philippine Islands and to provide a more autonomous government for those islands.

Yet there is not in the bill one word declaratory of "the purpose of the people of the United States as to the future political status of the people of the Philippine Islands."

If there were any doubt as to this proposition, the statement of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT], of the Committee on Insular Affairs, who has been aiding the chairman of that committee in presenting this bill, would clear all doubts. On October 2 the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURGESS] offered an amendment to be incorporated in the act as a new section, attempting to declare the purpose of the people of the United States as to the future political status of the islands, so as to take from the title of the act its falsehood and deceit by making it speak the truth. There was no question about the Democratic orthodoxy of the proposed amendment. The gentleman from Texas offered the following letter, written last January, on that point:

JANUARY 28, 1914.

MY DEAR BURGESS: I remember well your speech on the Philippine resolution in January, 1906, and was very favorably impressed then, and subsequent study has brought the fixed conviction that your resolution is the solution of the problem. It ought to be passed, as it not only accords with the last Democratic platform, but is based on the soundest and wisest principles.

Your friend,

CHAMP CLARK.

But hear the distinguished Tennesseean [Mr. GARRETT]:

Mr. Chairman, I am well aware of the great thought which my friend from Texas [Mr. BURGESS] has given to this question. The amendment which he offers is an exact copy of a resolution introduced by him in 1904 originally and which has been reintroduced at each succeeding Congress and has been before the Committee on Insular Affairs ever since I have been a member of the committee. I am in a large measure in sympathy with part of the sentiment of the resolution; but I respectfully submit to the membership of the House that it has no place at this point or at any other point in this bill.

Speaker CLARK has a trait, rather unusual in some quarters, of standing up for and defending what he believes in, so he asked the gentleman from Tennessee this question:

Why is not this Burgess resolution just as pertinent to this bill as the preamble which is on it now?

To which question the gentleman from Tennessee replied:

Mr. Chairman, if it were in proper form offered as an amendment to the preamble, I would not undertake to say that it was not pertinent to that, although it contains a direction, while the preamble only contains a recitation; but it is offered as an independent section, section 13, to the legislative part of the bill. You do not want to say by an enactment of law that it is the preference of the United States to do so and so.

Yet the title declares just precisely the opposite:

THE TITLE OF THE ACT.

A bill to declare the purpose of the people of the United States as to the future political status of the Philippine Islands and—

MR. GARRETT OF TENNESSEE.

You do not want to say by an enactment of law that it is the preference of the United States to do so and so.

Of course, nearly every Member of this House agrees with the gentleman from Tennessee, that we ought not to put into this bill such an enactment, yet when the motion is made, as it will be, to amend the title by striking out of it that portion which contains the false statement that the bill is to "declare the purpose of the United States to do so and so," the committee will oppose the amendment. They want that false pretense in the title and want to vaguely incorporate it in a series of whereases, entirely outside of and not a part of the bill. If it is not a part of the bill and is not fit for enactment in the bill, why put it in the title? And why oppose amending the title so as to make it obey that commandment which reads after this fashion, "Thou shalt not pattern the words of thy mouth after the words of Ananias?"

In the effort of this committee to placate and please the followers of Aguinaldo and a number of good men in the Philippines, who are ambitious to establish a petty kingdom or a republic in the Far East and to fool themselves and the people of the United States into believing that they are keeping their platform pledge, they put this "recitation," as the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee calls it, in the title and before the enacting clause of this bill. If they were to put it where it would have to be signed by the President, the Secretary of the Navy would beg, the Secretary of War would plead, and the Secretary of Commerce would urge, and the President would say to the members of the Cabinet, "Do you suppose I would be silly enough to sign such an enactment as that?"

It would be the very acme of absurdity to make such a declaration. If when I first went to the State of Washington I felt deeply on this subject, that feeling has been intensified by residence on the Pacific coast.

There is plenty of room on the Pacific for the yellow race and the white race, but we are sure to have trouble if we dilly-dally and fail to let our purpose be known. I would not deprive Japan of any credit due her for her marvelous development. We want to keep her friendship and we want to adopt a fair and friendly course with Japan. But we must have a fleet

in the Pacific to guarantee the open door in China and to protect American interests.

Is the open-door policy less important now? Are the interests of the Caucasian race less important at this juncture? Is our duty to maintain an equilibrium in the Far East and to preserve peace any less pronounced now?

Are we a nation of quitters? Are we going to flee for our lives? When we get out of the Philippines, are we going to get out of the other islands and out of Alaska? The whole propaganda is absurd. I do not blame the Democrats for keeping such a disgraceful policy out from under the enacting clause of any bill, leaving it where it is vain and void; but the manly, decent thing to do would be to stand firm for American sovereignty in the Philippines, for the open door in China, and for the white man on the Pacific.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from the Philippine Islands [Mr. QUEZON].

Mr. QUEZON. Mr. Chairman, it would be foolish, were it not so pathetic, to say, as does the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY], who preceded me on the floor, that the Filipino people do not want independence to-day and that they would not even desire it in the future when they really become capable of self-government. That, however, is not a new statement. It has been heard before now in every country and it has been availed of by every tyrant. No ruler can ever be made by any evidence to believe that his subjects want to be free from his yoke. The speech of the gentleman from Washington has been delivered before in more or less the same words before the House of Commons in England, the difference being that his people, not mine, were at that time struggling to be independent, while the British lawmakers were there asserting that those people did not want independence. The American colonies were then said to be, as the Filipino people are now said to be, led astray by unscrupulous, selfish politicians, who were wont to exploit and enslave their own people. Why, Mr. Chairman, how any man can say that the Filipino people, having defied, because they wanted to be independent, the greatest and most powerful Republic upon this earth, knowing when they did so that they would unavoidably be crushed in that unequal struggle, do not now want to be free is beyond my comprehension.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. JONES. I yield to the gentleman two minutes additional.

Mr. QUEZON. Is the committee unaware that thousands upon thousands of men drawn from all walks of life died in that destructive war while their wives, daughters, mothers, and sisters continued to urge the survivors to persevere until the whole nation was very nearly annihilated? Does the gentleman from Washington believe that that war was a joke, and that we went into it as a matter of amusement? How can he say that Filipinos will not want independence when they are capable of self-government? What an amazing theory, and yet it seems to be believed in and proclaimed by many statesmen as almost self-evidently true. If people do not want independence when they become capable of self-government, it must follow that no independent nation is capable of self-government. Indeed, I am almost inclined to accept that idea, and so to accept the view of the gentleman from Washington, when I see some of the most enlightened nations engaged in war, each killing the citizens of the other by scores of thousands, and each destroying wealth belonging to the others, thereby inflicting upon humankind more injury during a few months of their gigantic struggle than all the harm and destruction that the so-called incapable countries, with their petty revolutions, could cause in a century. But, Mr. Chairman, I shall not detain the committee in the closing hour of this debate by entering upon discussions of this sort. The arguments which proceed from such premises as those I have cited are outworn, obsolete, and completely out of date. Every boy in school knows how to answer them. I shall, in discussing the preamble of this bill, address myself exclusively to the views expressed by the distinguished leader of the minority, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Illinois takes the position that the preamble of this bill should be voted down, and that the legislative provisions of this bill should be amended so as to give the people of the Philippine Islands a government still more autonomous than is provided for in the bill. The gentleman's opposition to the preamble is placed squarely on the ground that the United States should forever retain the Philippine Islands, because such retention will provide this country with an important resource in a supposedly forthcoming struggle—commercial and perhaps military and naval—between the East and the West, while such retention would also prove beneficial to the Filipino people themselves. The gentleman is

convinced that with the granting of such an autonomous government as he suggests the Filipino people will grow more friendly to the United States and will be content to remain under American control.

Mr. Chairman, opposition to the preamble based upon the considerations stated by the gentleman from Illinois is worthy of serious attention and deserves to be met on its own ground. Let me say, before I reply to the gentleman from Illinois, that I have been particularly pleased with his remarks. His views and mine are, of course, widely and completely apart; but I give him credit, and I feel under obligation to him for not following the old line of insincere argumentation that has heretofore caused such shame and anger in the minds of the Filipino people, and that starts with the assumption that we are wholly incapable of governing ourselves or that we are an unpatriotic people, whose favored classes are eagerly watching for and taking advantage of every opportunity to abuse, mistreat, and exploit our fellow citizens, so that we must be ruled by more intelligent and more public-spirited foreigners. I am grateful to the gentleman from Illinois for his candor and openness, and I am sure my people join me in the sentiment. I know that his remarks will not be indorsed by a single Filipino; but, on the other hand, they will certainly not be resented by my countrymen. It was a businesslike presentation, composed of great thoughts elegantly clothed with apt expressions—this speech of the gentleman from Illinois. Yet I fear that the basic premise of his position is false, and that therefore the whole structure of his Philippine policy must fail to endure the test of time and of past experience.

I have noticed, Mr. Chairman, that, comprehensive as the speech of the gentleman from Illinois was, he failed to discuss—indeed, he apparently never gave a thought to—the one question which must be answered before his views can be accepted by analytical minds. That question is this: What would the United States do should the Filipino people, after they have been granted autonomy—complete domestic autonomy, if you please—still demand independence? Would the United States still insist, in such a case, upon keeping the islands, against the will of their inhabitants, under the sovereignty of this Nation? Would the United States, if necessary, resort to force to compel the Filipino people, under those circumstances, to continue subject to the American flag? Would the retention of the Philippines under such circumstances be an aid to the United States in such a forthcoming struggle as is predicted by the gentleman? The gentleman from Illinois did not deem it necessary to ask himself this question, because he took it for granted, as he stated it on this floor, that after you have given the people of the Philippine Islands complete autonomy, larger and greater autonomy than this bill confers, as he would gladly have you do, the Filipino people would become your good friends and would therefore no longer desire independence.

Mr. Chairman, I do not doubt, in fact I am sure, that the Filipino people will become your friends, your very good friends, after this bill is enacted. They would, however, be still more friendly to you if a measure providing for more autonomy, such as the gentleman from Illinois has suggested, should be passed. But I fear that the gentleman from Illinois is mistaken when he thinks that the Filipino people after the enactment of such a bill would prefer to remain forever a self-governing colony of this country. The gentleman seems to forget that the enjoyment of liberty makes people crave for more liberty still, and that the progress of nations toward freedom when once the first step has been taken does not cease until complete sovereignty has been attained. I do not pretend to be a prophet or even a statesman, and I shall not ask that my prediction—which after all is but a prediction that, like others, may prove to be mistaken—I shall not ask that my prediction be given more weight than the prediction to the contrary which has been offered by the gentleman from Illinois. Of one thing, however, I am sure, as sure as I am that I am alive and standing upon this floor now. That is, that if the Filipino people should ever surrender their ardent desire to be free from the United States, it would not be after the enactment of the bill that the gentleman from Illinois proposes and the defeat of the preamble of this bill as he suggests. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Illinois makes the realization of his hope an impossibility when he asks that the preamble of this bill be voted down—that preamble which confirms through a congressional declaration the promises heretofore made by the Executives of this Nation and by other representative American statesmen. If you defeat this preamble, in spite of the existence of such an autonomous government as you may confer upon the Filipino people, you will not make them your friends. If you defeat this preamble you will thereby at once lose the confidence of the people of the Philippines, and perhaps even their respect. Friendship and respect can only exist among nations as among

men when the conduct of those who have entered into relations with one another is free from all suggestion of bad faith. The breaking of a promise, the disregard of past pledges, is a sure cause of distrust and of disrespect.

Mr. Chairman, again and again the people of the Philippine Islands since the first American commander landed at the city of Manila have been told by the representatives of this Government in those islands that the United States was in the Philippines for the sole purpose of helping the Filipinos to establish the foundations of their independent national life. Those promises have been reiterated by the Chief Executives of this Nation in their messages both to the Filipino people and to the American Congress. Mr. Taft, Mr. Roosevelt, and Mr. Wilson in official documents that are recorded in the archives of this Government have each and all made such declarations. The Filipino people have taken the words of those officials at face value, regarding them as the words of the American people themselves, whom the Presidents I have enumerated represented when they made these declarations. To-day the American Congress is asked not to ratify but to repudiate those words and those declarations. And on what ground? On the ground that you need the aid of the Philippines that you may emerge victorious from a supposedly forthcoming conflict—commercial or armed—for the control of the Pacific. What effect, Mr. Chairman, would the action of this Congress exert upon the Filipinos should the advice of the gentleman from Illinois be heeded? The Filipino people would at once take the defeat of the preamble of the bill as a convincing proof that this Nation would repudiate the promises it early made whenever it might be to her interest to do so. After such a repudiation had occurred, how could any man ever expect the Filipino people again to have confidence in the American Nation? What would be the advantage to be gained by the enactment of a law establishing an autonomous government in the Philippine Islands if the Filipino people could not feel secure in the free and everlasting enjoyment of that autonomy, or if they must forever fear that, inasmuch as you repudiated your promise of independence made when you did not think the Philippines a commercial or strategic asset but changed your opinion on this subject when conditions made it convenient, you might in like manner establish another kind of government whenever you thought it best for your purposes to do so? Ah, Mr. Chairman, without confidence, without faith, always fearful of what might happen in the future, how could anyone expect the Filipino people to be contented and thus ask it to remain under the American flag?

There is another consideration so obvious that I note with surprise that so learned a student of human nature as is the gentleman from Illinois could have forgotten or overlooked it. Does the gentleman forget that the one fact whose invariable truth has been repeatedly demonstrated since God created the first man is that human kind always prefers forbidden fruit? So long as you tell the people of the Philippines that they can never be independent, so long will you be adding fuel to their already burning desire to be independent.

Mr. Chairman, perhaps the gentleman from Illinois, with his farsightedness, with his statesmanship, with his ability to look clearly into the dim and cloudy days of the far-distant future—qualities that fortune has not given me—is right in his expectations and his hope that the day will some time come when the Filipino people, after having been granted control of their domestic affairs and after having thus lived for so many years under the American flag—that would then mean to them the sovereignty of a strong and friendly nation, not the despotic rule of a tyrant master—may prefer to be permanently a self-governing colony of this empire rather than a free and independent republic born by this mother of republics. But should that ever happen, it would be only after the preamble of this bill had received congressional approbation; only after the Filipino people had been told by the American people through its constitutional representative—the Congress—that they may if they so desire be some day an independent and sovereign nation. Then, and only then, the Filipino people, reassured as to your good faith, convinced that whatever you may pledge yourself to do is assured of fulfillment when once the pledge is given, no matter whether your selfish interests do or do not dictate otherwise—then, and only then, may the Filipino people of their own free will and spontaneous volition decide that they prefer to maintain a permanent political relationship with the United States. And then, and only then, can that relationship be beneficial to both peoples, a real protection to the Philippines and a source of strength to the United States.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] cited the present relations between Canada and Great Britain as an illustration of what would surely come to pass were the Philippines to be granted full autonomy in the administration of their

domestic affairs and were this preamble to be defeated. He called the attention of the committee to the spectacle offered by that self-governing colony in hastening to the aid of her mother country in the great war now raging in Europe.

In the first place, I can tell the gentleman that it is too premature to assert now that the political ties between Canada and Great Britain will never be severed. Who is wise enough to predict that when Canada shall have increased sufficiently in population and wealth she will still prefer to be a colony rather than a sovereign nation? But whatever may be the permanence or the character of the relations between England and Canada, they would offer no evidence as to what will be the course of future relations between the United States and the Philippines. Two very essential circumstances in the relationship between England and Canada are absent in the case of the United States and the Philippines. In the former case there exists a community of race and of origin. Second, and perhaps more important still, England has never felt called upon to violate the pledge of her Government or any of her premiers in order to proceed with her colonial policy toward Canada. No promise of independence was ever made to the Canadian people, and therefore the element of international distrust has never disturbed the mind of the Canadian people. The present connection of Canada with England has been the natural outgrowth of a political tie whose severing never was thought of or announced.

Mr. Chairman, that is all I intend to say in connection with the speech of the gentleman from Illinois. I believe I have demonstrated for his benefit and for that of those who think with him that the only way to accomplish their purpose, if it could ever be accomplished, is by voting for this preamble and trusting to the future the development and determination of the final relationship between the United States and the Philippines. The retention of this preamble does not necessarily mean that you must grant the Philippines their independence, since, without being faithless, you could still retain your sovereignty over the islands should the Filipino people themselves, by common understanding with you, so desire, as the gentleman from Illinois thinks they might some day do. To those who assert that they do not want to retain the Philippines forever under the sovereignty of the United States, but that they would not vote for this preamble now because they do not believe that the day has yet arrived when independence should be granted, I say, if they are sincere in their protestations, they should vote for this preamble, because its language does not grant independence now, but simply states what they themselves admit to be their desire and their purpose. To those who believe in immediate independence I say that they should vote for this preamble because, while it does not grant immediate independence to the islands, it nevertheless does promise independence, and it is a long and decisive step toward actual independence.

Mr. Chairman, I shall now pass to another topic. Within a moment the committee will vote upon the bill, and I wish to say a word of sincere and deep-felt appreciation of the manner in which the membership of the committee on both sides of the House have acted in the consideration of this measure. I am personally obliged to them all for the unfailing courtesy and kindly consideration with which they have listened to my words and have received my suggestions. My people are likewise indebted to you, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee. They owe you a debt of gratitude that will last during all the years to come as long as the Filipino people live, because, no matter what they do and how hard they try, they will never be able to discharge that immense obligation. For, after all is said, we are only an episode to you; you have lived and developed into what you are—a rich, enlightened, powerful commonwealth—without us; nay, without even knowing of us. Those ties that cause and explain the existence of sympathetic interest between peoples of different nationalities do not bind you to us—the ties of race, of common origin, of kinship. Whatever may be said as to whether we need you or not—whether we need you always or temporarily—there can be no question that you will be and continue to be what you are, occupying either with or without us the same leading place among the powers of the world you now do and doubtless advancing faster without us. The salaries that a handful of American employees draw from the Philippine Government are of no concern to you as a Nation. What part you may now or in the future take in the development of our trade you may as well enjoy it without responsibility for us. And yet, I have had one more occasion to see during the debate of this bill the true regard that you feel for the Filipino people. Yes, Mr. Chairman; I have had confirmation during the consideration of this bill for what I said at the

opening of the debate. Referring to the remark of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER] that the Democratic Party had not kept faith with me, I said that not only had the Democratic Party kept faith with me, but that all parties—yes, every party in the United States—seem to be trying to do what they can for the Filipino people.

Mr. Chairman, the plane on which the members of the Republican side of this House have pitched their opposition to this bill has been a high one. Save some rather unedifying political maneuvers of a kind that seems to be unavoidable in every legislative body, and save certain unpleasant allusions to a past happily ended or that never existed except in the imagination of a few people, the whole trend of the debate, the remarks that have been made on both sides, the feeling among the Members which I have closely watched, all went to show conclusively that those who are for the bill and those who are against the bill have alike been prompted by the honest belief, by the upright motive, that their attitude was demanded by the best interests of the Filipino people themselves.

I wish, therefore, Mr. Chairman, to offer the most cordial thanks not only to those who have the credit for bringing forward this bill, but also to those who opposed it on so noble a ground. I wish to thank Democrats, Republicans, and Progressives alike. I wish to express to the American people my strong gratification that through the consideration of this measure, important as it is for the welfare of my people and so decisive for their future, the good will of this Nation toward us has been once more manifested through all its representatives, irrespective of party politics.

Mr. Chairman, when I return home it will be my pleasure, as well as my duty, to tell my people that you are really our best friends—every one of you. There is only one difference, so far as I have been able to see, between the Democratic Party and the Republican Party—I say nothing of the Progressive Party, because it has not in its own capacity as a political body had opportunity to deal with us—and that difference is this, that the Democratic Party in trying to do by us what it thinks is the best is more precisely in accord with our wishes, while the Republican Party in trying to do by us what it thinks is best is disregarding our wishes. Since, in my opinion, every nation, like every individual, knows better than their neighbor what is best for them, it would seem that the Democratic Party is in all probability the one that will do precisely what is best for us.

The Republican Party was in power during the first 14 years following American occupation of the Philippines. During that time Republican Congresses were able to enact without being obstructed by the then existing minority legislation that accomplished some good things for us. The organic act which gave us the assembly, and the Payne-Aldrich bill which increased the opportunities of our farmers and our merchants, are the two most important elements in this legislation. It is proper, Mr. Chairman, that the minority should now cooperate with the majority. I hope, therefore, Mr. Chairman, that the minority will find it convenient and wise, although withdrawing their approval if they so prefer, to let this measure pass unhampered, and also allow it speedily to become a law. And should it become a law we shall write with the fervor of gratitude in the annals of our country a glorious page bearing the names of the Members of the Sixty-third Congress. [Applause.]

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes of time to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. Young].

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment, which I desire to have read in my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

Preamble, second paragraph, third line, after the word "islands," insert: "ceded to the United States Government by the treaty of peace concluded between the United States and Spain on the 11th day of April, 1899, the boundaries of which are set forth in article 3 of said treaty."

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, while section 1 was under consideration I made some remarks upon the desirability and importance of limiting the declared purpose of the United States to the territory ceded in the treaty referred to in the proposed amendment just read by the Clerk, thus leaving for future determination the disposition of the small islands of Cagayan Sulu, Sibutu, and others obtained from Spain by separate negotiation and purchase in 1900. I attempted at that time to show why it would be unwise to destroy at this time our freedom to legislate in the future with respect to these small islands, located hundreds of miles away from the Philippine Islands, which are in no proper sense a part of the Philippine Islands. I shall therefore not pursue that subject further now.

Mr. Chairman, while legislation for the Philippine Islands is important and is well worth while, still there has been no very great pressure or demand for it. We have spent enough time upon this measure to have considered and passed a rural credits bill. The call of the banks was heeded, and the banking and currency bill was passed, and they have passed back the plate for a couple of helpings since, and are again knocking at the doors of Congress for additional legislation. During all this time the farmers have been waiting—patiently, I was going to say—but that is hardly the word. They are waiting with great impatience for Congress to strike from them the shackles of excessive interest charges upon farm mortgages.

This anxiety and unrest upon the part of the farmers is forcibly set forth in a letter by Hon. David Lubin, the well-known representative of the United States at the International Institute of Agriculture, Rome, Italy, where he has rendered incalculable service to American agriculture. Mr. Lubin writes, under date of September 28, 1914, to a Member of this House, as follows:

Commenting on your several communications, I wish to say that you should have a serious talk with the Democratic leaders of the House, so that if they see their way clear they may exert proper effort in having House Joint Resolution 344 immediately passed by the House and by the Senate.

Apart from anything that has been said in the hearings, I would add the following:

1. The strength of Germany is directly due to the "Landwirtschaftsrat."

2. It can be easily adapted and adopted in the United States.

3. It would eliminate the trusts.

Please remember that I did not invent this "Landwirtschaftsrat"; it is no brilliant inspiration of mine; I am simply a reporter, and as such I tagged after the administrations of Roosevelt and Taft to take this up. They did take up something, but it was a faint shadow with no substance. So I sent out thousands of documents written so that the farmer "with mud on his boots" could understand.

And when the farmer began to squirm Mr. Taft, toward the end of his term, began to "get busy," but his cry was in an incomplete shape and went out entirely too late.

Then the Democratic Party came along and took hold of the lines and promised to give the farmer rural credits. The promise was given on the "give-me-liberty or give-me-death" style. The farmers were to have rural credits immediately, if not sooner. The farmer was to have the best and first place in the legislative trough, a trough to be supplied with good and rich legislative slops. He was to have it sure, right then and there; and the first installment was to be rural credits. "Sink or swim," "live or die," the farmer was to have it sure. Rural credits was his. The Democratic Party affirmed this over and over and over again. And a Democratic majority has now been in session for a longer period than any session ever in the history of the United States. So there was plenty of time for the Democratic Party to deliver the goods to the farmer. But, let me ask, what has the farmer got from this same Democratic Party up to this minute? What has he got in the form of rural credits? Do you know? Does anyone know? But perhaps this party has something practical up its sleeve for the next session in November. Well, if it is in the form of the Bulkeley-Hollis bill, then it will all end in smoke.

There is a rural credit plan that can be adapted which is practical—the Landschaft. If we could make inquiries at this minute in Germany, we would find all other rural credit systems smashed; we would find the Government bonds depreciated, but we would find the Landschaft bonds just as they were before the war. The Democratic Party should have worked on the Landschaft, but it has not even caught onto a faint knowledge of what it is.

And now, to return to House joint resolution 344, if the Democratic Party allows this resolution to go into innocuous desuetude, it will prove itself truly to be the possessor of the long ears that we frequently see it pictured, for just as sure as the Democratic Party allows this "Landwirtschaftsrat" matter to go by default, it will be picked up and taken up by the Republican Party. What effective use this can be made of in practical politics will be evident to you if you will read over the hearings, and read it quietly, and pick out point 1, point 2, say, up to all the points that will count, and you will have a respectable number of counts, invaluable on the stump, invaluable in the papers, and damaging to the party who had the opportunity of handling this matter, but who either overlooked it by reason of a sluggish brain or, worse yet, for fear of offending the trusts; for, mark you, this proposal gives a death blow to the trusts, as you know, and as nothing else can do.

I presume that you have been informed that Creasy and his executive committee are now applying to the farmers generally for funds. Now, the greater part of these funds will, no doubt, be used in informing the farmers on this matter, in sending them, if you please, the hearings and other similar documents. In fact, a copy of this very letter is going to be sent to them, which they may send broadcast.

And now, and for all these reasons, as there is a short period yet of the session of this present Congress, there is ample opportunity to rush House joint resolution 344 through both Houses, provided, of course, that it is the will of the powers that be that this should be done.

Will you be good enough to inform me just what you propose to do in the matter; or, better yet, what you have done and what others have done, and what they have not done and what they would not do?

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, is the time to read the amendment taken from the time on this side?

The CHAIRMAN. One minute.

Mr. TOWNER. That was merely to read the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; but the gentleman asked to have it read in his time.

Mr. MANN. He offered it as an amendment.

Mr. SLAYDEN. But time was yielded to him.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Time was first yielded to him.

Mr. TOWNER. Very well. I now yield one minute of my time to the gentleman from California [Mr. CURRY].

Mr. CURRY. Mr. Chairman, this bill, among other things, proposes to provide a better system of government for the Philippine Islands; and, so far as that feature is concerned, it is an improvement on the present system. The objectionable part of the bill is the preamble, which is skillfully worded and misleading. If adopted, it will be understood by the oriental Filipino mind and by other oriental peoples as a positive promise of speedy independence. The qualifying sentence of when "they may be better prepared to fully assume the responsibilities and enjoy all the privileges of complete independence" will not be construed by them as postponing indefinitely their independence. They are capable of instituting an independent government now, although they may not be strong enough to maintain their independence and protect the islands against foreign aggression and annexation.

Their capacity for self-government may not be according to the American standards, but they could institute a government suited to their own lights and needs and degree of civilization. They would adapt their government to the conditions of life, habits of thought, and occupations of their people as affected by the climate, soil, and products of the islands, and their commercial and political intercourse with foreign States.

The adoption of the preamble to this bill will invite trouble, for if it should be adopted and the Philippines be not granted their independence within the next four or five years political agitators in the islands could easily incite an insurrection, which might have at least the moral support of the Orient behind it.

I will vote for the bill if you will strike out the preamble, or I will vote to grant the islands immediate independence if their people want it, provided the United States Government makes it plain that when once we withdraw from the islands we will not be drawn into a war on their account, that we will not protect them with force of arms against foreign aggression or annexation or domestic insurrection. Or I will vote to grant the Philippines independence under an international agreement entered into by the United States and other great powers—if it is possible to arrange such an agreement—guaranteeing in perpetuity the status of the islands as a free and independent state.

If the Philippine Islands were contiguous to the North American Continent, I would never vote for their separation from the United States. But they are located about 8,000 miles from us across the broad Pacific Ocean. They are peopled by an alien and nonassimilable race, with different habits of thought and mode of living. The climate is humid, hot, and to the Caucasian is enervating and unhealthy.

The possession of the islands is a source of weakness and danger, and they are of no material benefit to us as a dependency. Our trade relations with them could be made as advantageous if they were an independent nation as they are as a colonial possession.

I conceive that governing people as subjects and holding lands as colonial possessions is contrary to the genius of our free institutions.

We should strike out the preamble to this bill and, now that the question is before Congress, fix a definite time for Philippine independence or provide for their ultimate assimilation into the Union, first as Territories and then as States.

The Philippines as a whole is not a sparsely settled backwoods country. They number about 3,141 islands, ranging in size from 1 square mile to 40,969 square miles, which latter is the size of the island of Luzon. The actual land area of the islands is 115,026 square miles, or equal to that of the New England States added to that of New York and New Jersey.

The United States census of the islands in 1903 gave them a population of 7,635,426, mostly Malays; 7,000,000 are to a degree civilized, some of them highly civilized, and a few of the highest degree of culture. The wild tribes and non-Christian people numbered 647,740. Foreigners numbered about 50,000, of whom three-fourths were southern Chinese. There is no restriction on immigration into the Philippines, but there are very few Japanese in the islands, as its climate is as unadapted and unhealthy to the Japanese as it is to Americans.

Exclusive of the Army there were 8,135 Americans in the islands, nearly one-half of them being located in the city of Manila. The United States Census Bureau estimated the population of the islands in 1912 at 8,460,052. The density of population is about 76 per square mile. In continental United States it averages 26 per square mile. The population is made up of 25 different tribes, speaking 16 different native dialects.

Nearly all educated natives speak English or Spanish, or both, in addition to the language or dialect of their tribe. Seventy newspapers are published in the islands. The United States Government instituted the American system of public schools.

About 450,000 scholars are enrolled, and 7,671 teachers are employed, of whom 658 are Americans and the balance Filipinos.

During the year ending June 30, 1913, the Philippines imported from the United States merchandise amounting in value to \$25,360,646 and exported to the United States \$21,010,248 worth of merchandise. During the same period the total exports of the islands amounted to \$33,834,438 and the total imports amounted to \$30,948,498.

America has done much for the Filipino people. She freed them from the Spanish yoke by force of arms, and then paid Spain \$20,100,000 for them. Under American rule the inhabitants of those islands for the first time in their history are safe in the enjoyment of their life, individual liberty, and property, and are protected from exploitation; and common schools are maintained for the education of their children, notwithstanding which they seem not to be satisfied with our government and desire to set up a government of their own, which I am perfectly willing they shall do with the understanding that when we withdraw from the islands our Army and Navy will not be used to protect them from foreign aggression or domestic insurrection.

Now, that the question is before Congress, we should in plain language declare the status of the islands and our intentions toward them, and not try to fool the people by the adoption of the preamble to this bill, which is only a string of whereases of glittering generalities couched in diplomatic language and, so far as the independence of the Philippines is concerned, may be construed in the light of future events to mean anything or nothing.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SLAYDEN].

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I admire the frankness with which the gentleman from Washington [Mr. BRYAN] goes to the very meat of this matter.

He frankly admits the commercial appeal. He does not disguise the fact that the interest which he and his people have in the retention of the Philippine Islands is the possibility of gain from the connection. He is not like other gentlemen who have indulged in speech on this question and who get up here with nauseating cant and humbuggery, plain to everybody, which ought not to deceive a child, and tell us they want to retain the Philippine Islands and govern the Filipinos for the good of the Filipinos themselves. Surely, Mr. Chairman, no intelligent man can believe any such stuff as that. I thank the gentleman from Washington [Mr. BRYAN] for having spoken so very plainly on that question.

Mr. BRYAN. Will the gentleman yield just a moment? You come from the South. The race proposition is not purely commercial, is it, there?

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, the gentlemen from the Pacific coast are playing with fire. They are frightened by the prospect of a remote and improbable assault from a people who are hardly more than half our numbers and 6,000 miles away. They compare what they conceive to be theirs with the importance of other race problems, which I could but have not time to discuss. I have sympathized with them in their race problems, and I want to build up a barrier between the people of this country and alien races, when the association may lead to domestic or international trouble. I am in sympathy with them, but, sir, I shall not indulge in the humbuggery of saying that I do not want to sever the tie that binds that country to this, and which was not brought about by a mutual agreement at all, but out upon the Filipinos by force of arms, by saying that I am acting in their behalf.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Washington wants—and he states it frankly, for which I am obliged to him—to prevent Asiatics from coming into this country, but he wants to keep open the door swinging in that direction. He wants the privilege of going to the Philippine Islands and other Asiatic countries, no doubt including Japan, if he framed the thought that was in his mind, for the purpose of exploiting those people and those countries, and at the same time he wants to shut them out of this. Now, Mr. Chairman, I have always believed that there must be reciprocity in international affairs if we are to go along in comfort and in pleasant relations with the other peoples of the world. The Lord has given us a large portion of this globe, the fairest and best of it, I believe—in the Temperate Zone—suited to the people of our race and suited to our genius, and we should stay here and cultivate our own vineyard rather than precipitate troubles by trying to trespass on the rights of other people who are also created by the same Lord and given their share of inheritance in the world. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, any child ought to see that by going into Asiatic exploitation, by undertaking to exercise the rights of

government in those far-away parts of the earth, we are inviting trouble.

It is amazingly inconsistent, Mr. Chairman, and sure to bring disaster for us to demand privileges for Americans which we do not accord other people. It is morally wrong and the height of political folly.

The gentleman from Washington says that the people on the Pacific coast have a race problem compared to which that of the Southern States pales into insignificance. The gentleman also says that he was brought up in the State of Louisiana and taught the fundamentals of democracy there. When I realize the opportunities of his youth and see how far he has gone astray in his maturity, I begin to doubt that the tree inclines as the twig is bent.

He says that the people of Japan are intelligent, that they possess ingenuity and ability in all lines, that they are proud, that they have an ancient aristocracy, and he gives us to understand that they are quick to resent an affront.

If the people of Japan are intelligent, and they certainly are, they can see and appreciate an act of injustice, and I believe they would regard the application of the political views of the gentleman as a gross act of injustice. What right have we to demand from them what we are unwilling to concede to them?

I repeat now what I said to the gentleman from Washington, what I said when I interrupted his speech. We have no right to demand admission to Japan, except upon precisely the same conditions on which we are willing to admit them to our country. That is a plan of operation which ought to appeal to the spirit of fairness of everybody.

And in that spirit of fair play I hope to see this Philippine question considered. It is not inconsistent with trade development. Indeed, I think the exact reverse is true. Real commercial expansion, the only sort with which, in my opinion, we should be concerning ourselves, is based on a mutually beneficial trade. Americans ought to be the last people to take any other view. Our ancestors resented the efforts of a British Government to govern the American Colonies for the sole benefit of the British people, and out of that resistance grew the Republic of the United States. A hateful overlordship did not conduce to trade then on this continent, and it will not do it now in Asia or elsewhere. We ought to have learned a lesson from our experience in South and Central America, where, in spite of proximity and similar political institutions, we have not very successfully competed with Europe. That failure has been largely due to suspicion of our political designs. Distrust and dislike do not make a good start for trade.

This bill does not go as far as I would like. It does give the Filipinos a scheme of government which is good, if ours is, for it is largely a duplicate, but above and beyond that it promises them in the preamble, which so disturbs Republicans and the hybrid offshoot from that organization, liberty and independence.

It is to the credit of the Filipinos that in the presence of superior armed forces and under the weight of government imposed by remote and alien people they have never ceased to declare their hope of ultimate independence.

I rejoice in the fact that there are in this country still an impressive number of people who clamor for liberty, justice, and fair play. I hope that clamor may never be hushed, for when the voice of protest against the violation of American fundamentals like those found in the Declaration of Independence is stilled, our own liberties will not merely be in peril, they will be lost.

As I have said several times in the course of this debate, this bill is merely the first step in a program of justice, a program which will end in the complete independence of the Filipinos. The establishment of a Philippine government will open to us an opportunity of retiring from adventures which are not pleasing to our own people, which are repugnant to the Filipinos, and which needlessly took us into the range of possible oriental conflict.

I see the Chairman has the gavel in the air, and I will close by saying that in my judgment the way to teach people to be independent is to give them independence. Liberty is not promoted by locking people in prisons. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes of my time to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS].

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, the cavalier statesman of Texas—and that term is meant as complimentary—a moment ago stated that he was glad that certain Members did not deal with humbuggery, and he insinuated that the men who have claimed that the United States is maintaining an American occupation in the Philippines for the benefit of the Filipino are talking humbug. Now, I do not believe that this gentleman, who I do not think

is inclined to impugn motives of men, has any ground for stating that those who insist that the American occupation there shall continue on the basis of the good to the Filipino as well as to the benefit of the world at large are talking humbuggery. I do not believe that that is a fair statement. In 1898 we received the Philippines as the result of a war which was not our own choice, the results of which were not of our own choosing; but when we received those islands we received an obligation with the islands, and there was no possibility of our performing that obligation by setting the islands free, and thus guaranteeing them what some persons might think they ought to have. Our duty compels us to fulfill the obligation, stay there as we have thus far done, and do a work the like of which the world has never seen before, and I am sure not since.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Will the gentleman permit me a question?

Mr. FESS. Yes.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I want to say that I believe if there is a man on the floor of this House who is sincere in wanting to retain the Philippine Islands for the benefit of the Filipinos, it is the gentleman from Ohio. I think he is deceived. But with reference to the obligation which he says we inherited as a consequence of that war, does he not believe we have cherished that obligation as an opportunity for exploitation?

Mr. FESS. I do not.

Mr. SLAYDEN. I do.

Mr. FESS. I do not only say "no," but I say you do an injustice to the American people when you thus criticize our people after they have done the most remarkable piece of work, from the standpoint of cosmopolitan philanthropy, that the world has ever seen. [Applause on the Republican side.] There is no other case in the history of the world where a great Republic, with a people within its grasp, devoted its energy, its talent of brain and of heart, and its economic policies, to the good of the people, as in the case of the Government of the United States in its dealings with the Filipinos.

I have learned why the preamble is insisted upon; several Members have stated it. But I think it ought to go out of the bill, first, because it is totally unnecessary. The lawyer from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] who will speak later, will say the preamble can not be a part of any law. That being the case, in the name of goodness, why is it made a part of this bill? No other constructive measure, whether Federal or State, neither the Federal Constitution nor any State constitution, has a preamble in it, for the simple reason that the preamble is no part of the instrument. If it is no part of the instrument, then why put it in? I am opposed to it, first, because it is no part of the instrument, and as such can have no legal significance; and then, secondly, I am opposed to it because its results will be vicious. It will raise false hopes in the ambitious. It is misleading. And I am opposed to it, in the third place, for the reason that my friend from Kentucky [Mr. HELM] says they put it in because it is the will and testament of the Democratic Party to these people. My friend from Kentucky used harsh words in his reference to our treatment of the people of these islands. I can not understand the viewpoint of a Member who in reference to the American occupation and its results would employ the metaphor he used. His statement would indicate the American policy should be condemned at the very moment it is receiving the plaudits of all the world except the members of the majority party. The position he has taken to make this measure a Democratic will to the Filipinos deserves scrutiny.

Members of this House, can you justify writing a partisan platform into the terms of a measure designed to govern these people? That is what you intend to do. You have so stated in giving your reasons for the bill at this time. You have put in the beginning of the bill a preamble which you admit is no part of it, but is meant to maintain your pledge. It is the Democratic platform written into it. It is putting the legislation on the low plane of partisan affiliation. This legislation ought to be above that level. Both sides of this Chamber ought to be free from that charge. The Republican policy is to free this legislation and all insular legislation from partisan politics. This preamble, on the other hand, intending to write the Democratic platform in the bill, does not keep your promise as made. It is misleading as a Democratic promise, because whatever your purpose may be this preamble does not keep your promise. In 1900 you promised not what is in this preamble. You promised three things: First, to guarantee a stable government; and, secondly, independence; and, thirdly, to extend the Monroe doctrine over those islands. Those promises are not in the preamble.

I wonder whether anybody has noted the significance of attempting to extend the Monroe doctrine into the Asiatic

islands? It would be the most serious single step that this Nation could take. If you say to Europe, "You must stay out of Central America and South America," how can we extend to the Asiatic islands the same protection, exemption from European colonization, unless we do it in agreement with other countries?

That is the promise you made in 1900. You repeated it in 1904, only changing the phraseology, saying that we ought to do with the Philippines what we did with Cuba. You repeated it again in 1908, and you have virtually repeated it in 1912, only two years ago.

But, Democratic Members, hear me. That platform that promised three specific things—stable government, independence, and guaranty of neutrality—you refused to write into this law, for the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURGESS] introduced that very plank, and you voted it down in this House 4 to 1 the other day; and you raised the point of order to-day, and refused to allow it to come in. The Democratic policy has been specifically stated to do three things, all of which you rejected the other day and refused to accept to-day.

The Republican policy, on the other hand, has been not to promise, but simply to go on and do the work and fulfill the national obligation that came to us as the guardians of the islands.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman five minutes' more time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for five minutes more.

Mr. FESS. Some one suggested a few moments ago that these people yearned for liberty. I rather think that that statement is true. Certain people yearn for liberty. But, my friends, you confuse liberty and independence. The two are not the same. Liberty can only come from regulation. There is no such thing as liberty without law. Liberty under law is real liberty. Liberty not under law is license. Mexico has no liberty, has she? I think my friend from Texas [Mr. SLAYDEN] would admit this, and he will also admit that Mexico has independence, and with the kind of independence she exercises she has lost her liberty; and in the degree that the independence of the Mexicans has been recognized they have forfeited their liberty.

I want to cite to you some striking examples: Australia has liberty, but not independence. New Zealand has liberty, but not independence. Canada has liberty, but not independence. Mexico has independence, but what can you say about her liberty? The Filipino has at this moment greater liberty in his participation in local government in over 700 towns than he would have if there was independence there.

Some one rose a while ago and said it is not a matter of what we think that we ought to fasten upon the people of the Philippines, but it is what they want. Now, my friends, that is a proposition that I resist. I say that it is a foolish statement, that the ward must control the action of his principal by his own wishes, his caprices, as it may be. The principal is acting in the interest of his ward, and what the action of the principal is is not to be determined by the mere wish or caprice of his ward. The principal ought to do what, in his judgment, the interest of his ward would command, and not the caprice of the ward. These 8,000,000 Filipinos now under the American Government, having seen in 16 years the most marvelous progress of any nation in the world, when viewed then and now, are at this moment enjoying such a participation in local self-government as other countries with independence do not enjoy. And as long as the American system will stay there in the interest of the Filipino, he will be secure in his enjoyment of liberty.

I want to repeat again: When I vote against this preamble I will vote against it, not because it was proposed by this Congress, and not because it has not been proposed by a Republican Congress, but because, first, it is useless; second, it is unnecessary; third, it is ill advised; and, fourth, it is vicious in holding out false hopes to the Filipino, stirring him, making him think that he has independence, and you here stating that he has not. My friends, I must vote against it, and my vote will be directed by my view of duty to the Filipino, and not by any other reason. [Applause on the Republican side.]

If the preamble were omitted, I should not withhold my support of the measure. The body of the bill is an attempt to increase participation in government, and is a step nearer to that goal. But any attempt to hold out to either the Filipino or the world that the United States will abandon these islands is too preposterous a proposition for me to support. Under the circumstances under which we assumed the obligation the

Republican Party could not indorse this piece of Democratic jugglery.

Mr. Chairman, the Philippine Islands came to us as a result of war. Their possession by us was the least of our intentions when we took up arms against Spain in behalf of humanity. The irony of the situation is revealed by the inconsistency of mankind. When the Republican President of the country was doing his utmost to hold at bay the dogs of war, Democratic leaders, in and out of Congress, were loud in their condemnation of the lack of backbone of McKinley. When at last the war was on, and Spain was driven from Cuba and the Philippines, these same leaders, or many of them, denounced the President for accepting the results of war.

Before the war began they denounced the head of the Government for his inaction. When the war ended they denounced him for his action. Even to-day we hear from irresponsible babblers the Philippine policy referred to as "horrible carpet-bag government."

The Republican Party showed the courage necessary to complete a work that was once begun. After having driven Spain from the islands, it did not sulk behind the flimsy excuse of irresponsibility to withdraw the majesty of the Republic and leave those islands as rich prizes to be exploited by whatever government that might set up a claim to them.

The Republican Party looked upon the situation as a national obligation to the Filipino created by our arms. That obligation the party has steadily fulfilled. The fulfillment has up to date occupied 16 years of constructive nation building. These years offer a challenge to the world. They will record the most advanced methods of modern civilization exemplified in any section of the world. These years will reveal a consecration of talent of brain and heart and sound business methods never before displayed by a superior toward an inferior people. The record thus far is made up. The past at least is secure. The future is dependent upon the contingency of a Democratic administration now tampering with the welfare of those people.

What has been the attitude of the party now in power toward the Philippine problem?

As I said before, two years after those people became our wards the Democratic Party declared against the Republican policy and demanded three specific things: The United States must guarantee a stable government, Philippine independence, and extend the Monroe doctrine over the islands.

It goes without saying that so long as the United States remained in control all of these features were assured. But the Democrats demanded our withdrawal, and at the same time our guaranty of conditions which would not permit our withdrawal, a most glaring inconsistency not only in fact, but in terms as well.

In 1904 the party in convention assembled virtually repeated its declaration of four years before.

In 1907 it reaffirmed its former position, and in 1912 repeated it.

Four times in national conventions the party now in power denounced the Republican policy in the Philippines, which, outside of the Democratic junta, has won the admiration of all the world, and as often has declared for independence and neutralization of the islands.

To-day the party controls all the lawmaking machinery of the Government.

It has a majority in this House equal to the entire minority, and is capable of steam-rolling any sort of a measure it sees fit to propose. It controls the Senate with less ruthless methods. It has the Executive, or rather it better be said, the Executive has it, for to an onlooker the Congress is little more than a Punch and Judy performance. Its performance under the new rôle is a splendid exhibition of "Babes in Toyland."

Now, with the entire machinery within complete control of the party which for 16 years has denounced Republican rule, and which has demanded independence and neutralization, in platform and on the stump, what does it propose?

This bill, which, outside of the preamble, is but a copy of the organic act of 1902. Aside from a few minor items, the bill is the Republican organic act of a dozen years ago. The only Democratic feature of it is found in the preamble, which is the one mischievous item in the entire work.

The bill proper does not have a single item of independence or neutralization in it.

It does not only avoid these items, but, as I before stated, when the Member from Texas [Mr. BURGESS] offered his amendment looking to fulfilling the various promises made in at least four national campaigns the Democratic House voted down the amendment 4 to 1.

What has become of these promises made when the party was out of power? Then its function was denunciation. Now, when all power is in its hands, what does it offer? It falls back in this case, as in most others, upon Republican laws as a basis for operation, and offers the empty promise in the form of a preamble which can not be a part of the law.

Here we have the striking example of the incompetency of this Congress. For the first and only time, so far as is known in history, we are offered an organic act for the government of a people with the platform of a political party affixed as a preamble.

To say nothing about the mischievous results of attempting to stamp a partisan significance upon a plan of government of eight millions of people by adding a party platform to the law, and the equally dangerous step which places a new weapon into the hands of ambitious politicians to be employed in their efforts of propaganda, what should be said of a Congress which is willing to write a promise as a part of the law which it concedes can not be any part of the law, and thus deceive millions of people as to the significance of the promise?

No man will deny that a preamble has no legal effect. It is no part of the law to which it is affixed. If it can not be effective, what is the purpose of affixing it? Whatever be the purpose, it can have but one effect, namely, mislead the people for whom the law is written. On the face of the law it appears as a part of it, to become effective. In reality it can not be a part of it and can have no legal effect. To the Filipino it says independence is granted when stable government is established. He asks, When is that? If not now, then you give us nothing we have not had before. The one difference between Republican and Democratic policies is, Republicans seek performance and Democrats are satisfied with promises.

Mr. Chairman, I look upon this preamble as a most vicious innovation in legislation. As before stated, it is the only case of its kind in legislation of this sort, so far as I know.

From the Federal Constitution of 1787 down to the last State constitution—of Ohio, in 1912—numbering more than 60 documents, all told, so far as I can ascertain not a single one contained a preamble. This is not confined to the State constitutions, but extends to the territorial governments of the various States, to Alaska, Porto Rico, Hawaii, and the Philippines. True it is that the Articles of Confederation of 1781-1787 did have a preamble, but all students of political science agree that this instrument was so weak and ineffective that it broke down immediately and had to be superseded within six years of its adoption. The pitiable situation is disclosed in the willingness of this House to inject an unwise, ill-advised deception as the very first act of this Congress in its legislation touching the Filipinos, not to give any legal status, which a preamble can not do, but to write a Democratic plank in the law, which can have but one effect—to hold out to the Filipino a false promise which can not be effective and can only work mischief in the islands. The Republican policy is the only wise procedure. The administration since American occupation speaks for itself. The eating of the pudding is the best proof. We have gone step by step, testing the capacity of these people for self-government. We have extended that principle as fast as men trained in that art say we can go. In 16 years wonders have been accomplished. This has been carried on without raising false issues or holding out false promises. The Republican policy is one of doing, not of promising. I here and now warn the Democratic Members of this Congress against inaugurating false pretensions, which can have no good results either for Filipinos or Americans.

If you are able to continue the wonderful work accomplished since American occupation you will be fortunate. Otherwise the future holds for you its severest condemnation.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to my colleague from Virginia [Mr. MONTAGUE].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MONTAGUE] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Mr. Chairman, this bill is, in my opinion, a distinct contribution to the ultimate solution of the Filipino problem. That solution, sooner or later, must eventuate in the form of an independent and autonomous government for the people of those islands.

I say "independent," because eventually the Filipino people will have this independence, whether by voluntary action on our part or by the exercise of force on their part. In other words, sooner or later, and in one way or another, the tide of freedom in those islands will rise to the level of independence.

And on our part, Mr. Chairman, we are in no position to withhold from these people their ultimate independence. There is no place under our system of government for colonial de-

pendencies. The Constitution gives us no authority to hold territory unless for temporary purposes and for final dedication to statehood. If these islands are retained by us as colonial dependencies, then we violate our whole system of government. Indeed, Mr. Chairman, if we were right in our policy as respects Cuba, we are wrong in the contrary policy to the Philippine Islands.

Mr. Chairman, I am not for hurrying the Filipino people to independence or self-government. I would concede an abundance of time to these islanders to test their capacity for self-government. I do not think that you can fit government upon these people as you can fit a suit of clothes upon a man. I realize, as every student of history must, that governments of the same name differ widely in powers and practices. For example, the Republic of Venice was not the Republic of Florence. The Republic of Switzerland, after throwing off the yoke of Austria, was quite different from the Republic of Holland after emerging from the oppression of Spain. Indeed, the present French Republic differs from the second, and the second differed from the first, and all of these Republics differ from that of the United States.

But, Mr. Chairman, the expressions of Presidents McKinley, Roosevelt, and Taft, as well as the great current of American thought, have all been to the end that the Filipino people should have their own government, after sufficient training and opportunity to absorb American ideals and systems. President McKinley eloquently declared that forcible annexation was criminal aggression. The argument to be drawn from this aphorism is that we should assume for a time the great trust of helping these people to appreciate and understand the genius and working of self-governing institutions. If this be not so, why have we toiled and sacrificed and fought to give the Filipinos an adequate appreciation of the benefits of the Government which we have adopted and which we so devoutly revere?

Many of the arguments, Mr. Chairman, made here today by gentlemen on the other side of this House are quite contradictory and irreconcilable. The motives underlying these arguments I do not question, though the partisanship which imputes only the base method of party supremacy or immediate party victory to this side of the House is neither creditable nor convincing in discussing a measure of this magnitude. I have great respect and good will for the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Fess] who has just spoken; yet if his argument be sound, we have been blind leaders of the blind in that far eastern archipelago. This distinguished gentleman enumerates with zeal the contributions made by America to the education and development of the Filipino people. He seems to forget that we can not stir the passions of liberty among these people or educate them to appreciation of self-government and then restrain the influences and forces that grow out of liberty and intelligence. We can not give these people education, imbue them with the blessings of liberty, and then make no reply to their insistent and ardent inquiry as to how or when we will give them the right to stand alone among the Governments of the earth.

The policy, Mr. Chairman, disclosed on the other side of the House, consists alone in counseling delay or the suppression of any declaration of purpose or policy save an implied assent to a continuance of the existing status. When the Filipino people ask when they may expect any change, the answer on the other side of the aisle is, "Not now; wait."

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONTAGUE. I have but five minutes, but I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FESS. I was just going to ask the gentleman whether this bill fixes the time?

Mr. MONTAGUE. I will soon come to that, but the gentleman from Ohio has just gone into refined disquisitions as to the distinction between liberty and independence. Does the gentleman think that in 1776 the American Colonies would have been satisfied with a promise of liberty from Great Britain, but a withholding of our independence at the same time? If so, there would have been no Declaration of Independence. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I care very little for the details of this bill, except for the preamble containing the declaration of the purpose of the American people, and the torch to light the hopes and aspirations of the Filipino people. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I regard the preamble as declaring a probationary state into which the Filipino people will enter in order to demonstrate their fitness for free institutions. I construe the preamble as a substantive assurance of independence, as I construe in turn the text of the bill to lay down certain tests to determine the extent of our promise and the fitness of the Filipino people to assume that independence. In other words, the preamble of the bill is an American declaration of opportunity to the Filipino people,

just as the text of the bill itself gives to the Filipino people liberty, power, and opportunity to test the declaration and purposes embraced in the declaration. We declare that we will give them independence when they deserve it, and to this end we furthermore lay down certain governmental functions which we ask the Filipino people to assume and perform, and when done then the extension of free government or independence will be given them.

It was never the purpose, as it can not be the right, of the United States to withhold from the Filipino people a declaration of our purpose respecting their ultimate independence. We can not continuously say in answer to their prayers for independence, "Not to-day, not to-morrow," and so on.

Mr. COOPER. Suppose the reply is "never."

Mr. MONTAGUE. I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin, and I hope to reach his suggestion in a moment. I was about to say that I agree with the statement made on the opposite side of the House awhile ago that the promise contained in the preamble is dependent upon certain exigencies hereafter to happen. I do not shrink from that argument. I embrace it gladly. For, I repeat, the essence of the declaration contained in the preamble is not as to time, but as to substance. This declaration to the Filipino people is, to use the language of the street, when you "make good" of the liberties and opportunities given you, then we will keep our promise as to independence.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. JONES. I yield to the gentleman two minutes more.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The distinguished leader of the Republican Party [Mr. MANN] seems to voice the present attitude of his party when he declares that the Filipinos are never to have independence, but must remain always under the guardianship of the United States. He declares it is "our duty, first, to keep the Filipinos under the flag of the United States, and, second, to make them our friends." With all respect to the gentleman, his propositions are irreconcilable. You can "never keep the Filipinos" and at the same time make them your friends. [Applause on the Democratic side.] To hold people against their will and to have their friendship at the same time belong to those irrepressible conflicts ever existent in human nature.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONTAGUE. Yes.

Mr. MANN. We kept the South, and they are still our friends, I believe, which is a very good illustration.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The gentleman can not lead me into an argument of that kind, because the analogies are so wide apart.

Mr. MANN. But the gentleman will admit that the statement is true.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Will the gentleman admit that the people of the same flesh and blood, and existing on the same soil and under the same Government, are analogous to the Philippine situation?

Mr. MANN. We made them our friends, did we not?

Mr. MONTAGUE. I fear the gentleman's prejudices have confused his logic. I prefer not at this time to discuss the analogies involved in the gentleman's question.

Mr. GARRETT of Texas. The South has been far better to the Union than the gentleman from Illinois has been to the South.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Mr. Chairman, alluding to the argument of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Fess], I would emphasize his assertions as to what the American Government has done for the Filipinos. We have endeavored to give them American institutions, American ideals and standards, American civilization. What does this mean? It means aspirations for liberty; hopes for independence. It means public free schools; and I beg you to observe every time a book is put into one hand of a Filipino boy, sooner or later, if you withhold his independence, there will be a sword in the other hand. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Endow liberty with intelligence, and the people will soon have a passionate glory that will eventuate in independence, even though the sword be necessary to this end.

Mr. Chairman, some rather strange arguments have been submitted during this debate. I call attention to only one at this time. It is contended that the permanent retention of the Philippine Islands under our flag is necessary as a great peace measure. That these islands, 10,000 miles from our western shores, are the sentries and the fortresses to exhibit and protect American liberty in the Pacific. Aye, that war is as certain to come between the far eastern or Asiatic races and ourselves as "the sun rises and sets," and for the necessities of our Government, for the peace and civilization of America, we must hold these islands. They are our rock and our defense in the hour of certain conflict. The answers to these arguments are

many and conclusive, but I only wish at this time to submit that distance and separation diminish as proximity and proximity increase the causes of war. It is not, Mr. Chairman, our western continental boundary, washed by the Pacific, but our far eastern islands, close to the shores of China and Japan, that must give occasion for apprehension.

I further submit that a continuance of our possession and government of these islands will inexorably result in the establishment and maintenance of militarism of prodigious proportions, imposing immense burdens upon our people and necessarily provoking the suspicion and ill will of the contiguous nations in this archipelago.

Moreover, Mr. Chairman, basing our policy of retention upon material considerations, I submit that our commerce will be greater, our relations will be happier, when we have opportunistically and wisely relaxed our hand and our guidance and given to these islands our good will and affectionate sympathies. When this fortunate day comes the altruism and majesty of America will command the respect and admiration of the civilized world. [Applause.]

Mr. TOWNER. I will say to the gentleman from Virginia that we have only one speech on this side.

Mr. JONES. Only one speech on that side? Will the Chair kindly inform me how much time remains?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia has 24 minutes remaining.

Mr. TOWNER. And how much on this side?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa has 18 minutes remaining.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, in opening the discussion upon this bill, now more than two weeks ago, I said all I cared to say in respect to this preamble. I showed, I think, that it does not go further in promising the Filipinos their independence than McKinley, Roosevelt, and Taft repeatedly went in declarations made by them. The only difference is that those were declarations which are not now regarded as binding upon the Republican Party, although those distinguished gentlemen were when they made them the recognized leaders and spokesmen of that party.

The gentleman from the State of Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY] has just informed us that the Democratic Party was the only party that had ever declared for Philippine independence, and he evidently seemed to think that that fact was a reproach to it.

Mr. Chairman, the only reason why, in my opinion, the Republican Party has never authoritatively and definitely—never in any national platform—declared its position upon this transcendently important question is that it lacked either the honesty or the courage to do so. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, there are no brighter pages in the glorious history of the Democratic Party than those upon which are written the declarations of that party in favor of Philippine independence, and none that gives me more pride, for it is a source of infinite joy and pride to me that there is at least one party in this land of liberty and freedom that still believes in the principles enunciated by the greatest apostle of human liberty the world has ever produced, the ablest as well as the most courageous champion of free popular government known to ancient or modern history.

Mr. Chairman, it is enough for me to know that in favoring a declaration promising Philippine independence I am following the teachings of Thomas Jefferson and obeying the mandates of the party founded by him, which alone of all the parties in this Nation has the courage of its honest convictions. It should never be forgotten, by any Democrat at least, that it was Thomas Jefferson who gave voice to the imperishable truth that "every man and every body of men on earth possesses the right of self-government." Said he: "They receive it with their being from the hand of nature."

Mr. Chairman, the preamble to this bill but states in different words the utterance of the father of the Democratic Party that "the people of every country are the only safe guardians of their own rights." Mr. Chairman, I hold in my hand a copy of a letter received by a Member of Congress from the Hon. Francis Burton Harrison, the Governor General of the Philippine Islands, and written as recently as the latter part of August, in which he comments at considerable length upon this bill. I now desire to read one or two extracts from this letter. He writes of it:

I believe the solid and substantial people in the islands, among both Americans and Filipinos, are generally in favor of the bill, and that it will prove satisfactory here.

To my mind the most important feature of the whole bill is the recital in the preamble of the intention of the United States to recog-

nize their independence as soon as a stable government can be established therein. Without that feature the bill would be received with very, very great disappointment in the islands. It would also be a very serious disappointment to me. Ever since our acquisition of the Philippines, each administration has given to the Filipinos assurances in that general direction. To omit from the bill a statement of that sort now would seem to the Filipinos a reversal of what they have understood to be the American policy, and a failure to perform what they believed to be our promises. The result would be most unsatisfactory, indeed, and would infinitely aggravate the difficulties of the United States in governing these 9,000,000 people.

Mr. Chairman, this is what the Governor General of the Philippine Islands has to say of this bill. In his deliberate opinion, to omit such a declaration of the Nation's purpose as to the future political status of the Philippine Islands as is contained in the preamble to this bill would be a serious disappointment to him, and, moreover, would infinitely aggravate the difficulties of the United States in governing the 9,000,000 of Filipino people. Shall we then heed the words of Gov. Gen. Harrison when he tells us that the solid and substantial people in the islands, both American and Filipinos, favor this bill or listen to and be misled by the uninformed and irresponsible asseverations of those who, lacking in sympathy with the aspirations of the Filipino people for freedom, would deny to them their independence?

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the remainder of my time. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, the statements that have been made here upon the floor of the House abundantly prove the truth of what I said at the commencement of this discussion and the consideration of this bill. It is a political bill, pure and simple. In its inception it is political. It was reported here for a political purpose, and it is considered here for a political purpose, and is kept here for a certain length of time for a political purpose. The gentleman who has just left the floor tells us that the Governor General, representing his party in the Philippine Islands, says that the principal thing in the bill is its preamble. It would be a great disappointment, he says, to the people of the Philippine Islands if this preamble is not passed. I wonder if that kind of statement satisfies the Filipino people? They are demanding immediate independence, and have been demanding it for years. Two years ago the chairman of this committee and the majority of this committee reported a bill which was considered to be the exposition of the Democratic position at that time—a bill in which they granted to the Filipinos independence, at least qualified independence. During a period of eight years the United States was to exercise supervisory control over them, but there was a Republic instituted. It was called the Philippine Republic. It had the form and insignia of an independent government with very few exceptions, indeed. It promised that absolute independence at the expiration of the period of eight years should be given the Philippine Government. What has become of that bill? It is not here before us to-day. There is no such bill under consideration now. There is no promise to the Filipino people of independence now, unless we are expected to take seriously the language used in the bill—that they will grant the people of the Philippine Islands independence when a stable government is established.

There is a stable government established there now, and they are not given independence. If the one established is not "stable," what kind of a government would be stable, and how can it be secured? What is the standard by which we can know when independence may be given? Gentlemen contend there is a stable government, a good government, there now. They contend that these people are able to maintain it, and yet they say, "No; we will not give it to them until they establish a stable government." But how can they establish a stable government unless you give them a chance to try, unless you give them immediate independence. That you should have the courage to do if you believe in it. If you do not, you are violating not only your promises made to them through your leaders from year to year for the last 10 or 12 years, but you are violating the promises you made to them when you drew and introduced the former Jones bill and said you intended to pass it just as soon as you had control of the Government. And you are violating your promises to them now when you say this leads to independence.

It is suggested here that the passage of this bill with its preamble will give a great satisfaction to the Filipino people. Let us see whether or not it will, and the testimony which I offer will not be impeached from the Democratic side of the House. I have in my hand the organ of the Filipino people in the United States, edited by my brilliant friend the representative from the Philippines, MANUEL QUEZON. In this, speaking to the Filipino people regarding the bill, under as late a date as July of this year, he says in the leading editorial regarding the new Jones bill:

We have thus set forth in colorless terms the significance of the new bill. That it will be a disappointment to many who had hoped that the present administration of the United States intended to effect the immediate separation of the Philippines from the domination of America, we have no doubt.

That is the good news that will be carried to the Filipino people when you pass this bill. That is the good news that will be carried to all those people in the Philippines longing for immediate independence, and believing that they ought to have it. And if in connection with that story they are told that each succeeding two years of time a new bill is introduced which grants to the Filipinos less power than its successor, the Philippine people will understand what is meant by the promises that the Democratic Party are giving to them. My distinguished friend from Virginia made a very significant statement when he was on the floor this afternoon. I allude to my friend, Gov. MONTAGUE, when he used this language:

I care very little for this bill except the preamble.

I wonder if people understand really the significance of that? The preamble is purely political, made for political purposes. It can not help the Filipino people one particle. It is not even a promise on which anybody under any circumstances can rely for anything, and yet my friend from Virginia says, "I care very little for this bill except the preamble."

Mr. MONTAGUE. Will the gentleman permit me?

Mr. TOWNER. Certainly.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The gentleman will note that I was speaking very rapidly. What I meant to state was that in the sense of proportion the preamble was far more important than the items of the bill itself, and not that I do not think highly of the text or the subject matter of the bill. Now, if the gentleman will pardon me further, he has just said, "Suppose you take less and less from the Philippines each succeeding Congress." I reply, "Suppose, more and more of the rights of free government are given by each succeeding Congress to the Philippines." What then will be the result? [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. TOWNER. My good friend spoke, probably instinctively, just what his party believes and always has believed. They do not care for the Filipino people; they never did. They do not now care for the islands, and never did.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I hope the gentleman will not put me in that category.

Mr. TOWNER. No; I am not. I am speaking of the gentleman's party now.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I have not spoken of this as a party question.

Mr. TOWNER. It makes no difference whether the gentleman has or not, he has voiced his party's position, and that is what Democrats now believe. They only desire to get rid of the islands on any terms and as soon as possible. It makes no difference to them about the terms of this bill, whether it gives better government or larger liberty or greater privileges or a better chance in the world. It makes no difference to them whether they receive more education, whether they secure a greater opportunity to really enjoy liberty under the terms of the bill.

But they really enjoy playing politics with it. It is very amusing and affords opportunity for saying such fine things about "liberty" and the "consent of the governed."

Mr. SLAYDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOWNER. Certainly; I will.

Mr. SLAYDEN. The gentleman has made a strong indictment against the party of which I am a humble member. Does he remember the Scripture text, "By their fruits ye shall know them"?

Mr. TOWNER. Yes; I do. I remember that text well, and I want to know whether or not the Democratic Party has ever given the Philippine Islands or any man there anything that has not been under Republican laws and an adoption of Republican policies from the beginning?

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. TOWNER. I can not yield further.

Mr. Chairman, the fact is that this whole system of government that is now instituted and under which the Philippines have made this marvelous progress was formulated and instituted by the Republican Party. There has not been one single law placed upon the statute books by any Democrat at any time.

Mr. JONES. Will the gentleman let me ask him just one question?

Mr. TOWNER. I will yield for one question.

Mr. JONES. I would like to ask the gentleman if it was not the Democratic Party that gave the Filipinos the control of both branches of their legislature?

Mr. TOWNER. The Democratic Party? No. Your President merely appointed one more man on the Philippine Commission, belonging to the Filipino people, than had been there before.

Mr. JONES. Did not that give them control?

Mr. TOWNER. Certainly, it gave them control, and the control is exercised, and there has been no change in the policy of the party in the Philippine Islands. It is exercised under the laws that were placed upon the statute books by the Republicans.

Mr. Chairman, the Republican Party has been the only friend that the Filipino people have ever had. It has stood by them through all these years, giving them a continual and larger measure of liberty. It has given to them education; it has given them a real understanding of what liberty means. Under their direction the Filipino people have been enabled to make their strongest showing that they are capable of independence. I do not object to their ambition. I think it is a splendid tribute to them that they are capable of indulging in this dream, nay, this expectation, if you choose to call it such, of independence. I hope they may attain it in the future, if that is then their wish; but I hope still more that when the time comes, when they are capable of exercising the right of self-government and entire independence, they will believe that it will be better for them, as I believe it will be better for us, if they shall keep at least a measure of association with the United States. I believe that the time will come when the Filipino people will themselves realize that.

Mr. Chairman, the belief seems to exist in many minds that we can easily secure the neutralization of the islands, and that will settle the whole difficulty. I think, gentlemen can hardly understand what is meant by neutralizing the islands. Every nation in the world is perfectly willing to recognize the neutrality of the islands, but that will be of no benefit to the Philippine Islands. In order to be any protection to them you must secure a treaty guaranteeing neutrality to the Philippine Islands. But what nation will do that? Any nation perhaps that may be allowed to exploit the islands. We have never exploited the islands and we will never agree that any other nation shall exploit them. No nation will undertake to guarantee the neutrality of the Philippine Islands unless it will be to their advantage to do so. You can not expect that. Do you believe that Great Britain, or Germany, or France will assume the responsibility of guaranteeing the neutrality of the Philippine Islands unless it shall be of some benefit to them? Will they accept such a burden merely for altruistic purposes, merely for the purpose of helping the Philippine Islands? No, they will say to the United States, "You are doing that; you are taking care of the Philippine Islands; that is your responsibility; you have to guarantee their integrity and protect them. Why should we do so? That is your responsibility and not ours." They will say to us, "If there are any particular inducements you can offer, if you have any special concessions to make, if you can make it of interest to us, we may consider your proposition," and that is what it will be impossible for us ever to do. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask if all amendments that are to be voted upon have been offered? They should be before the closing speech is made. I will ask the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER] if there are any other amendments to be offered?

Mr. TOWNER. I will say to the gentleman that I know of none.

Mr. JONES. They ought to be offered now, as the gentleman will understand.

Mr. TOWNER. Yes.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, how much time have I remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. Fifteen minutes.

Mr. JONES. I yield that much time to my colleague on the committee, Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, we are about to do a great thing. The distinguished but very partisan philosopher from Ohio [Mr. Fess], in company with a number of other gentlemen, has declared against the preamble to this bill. They say in one breath that they are against it because it means nothing, and say in the next breath they are against it because it means so much. Measuring their utterances in the light of the speech delivered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] a few days ago, I am constrained to believe that the expression in the latter breath presents the reason for their opposition.

Gentlemen know that the passage of this bill, with its preamble, means the taking of a decisive and definite step toward the consummation of an event which will be not only epochal, but unprecedented in the history of human kind—the voluntary and willing withdrawal of sovereignty by one people from over another people. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Strange as it may seem and is, every step which has been taken toward human liberty, the natural state of man, has been taken across the forms of battle-slain dead, and blood-stained flags are the only emblems that signal across the centuries the accomplishment of fundamental governmental things. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Not from fear, but because we are just, we are ready to take this step toward the reversal of that age-old rule of cruelty and barbarism and selfishness. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The issue has been clearly drawn here, if it had not been drawn before, by the utterances of the minority leader [Mr. MANN] in his terse but comprehensive speech made upon this floor, and it has been suggested again and again throughout the course of this debate that his speech has not been answered save by a sneer. Mr. Chairman, I shall not undertake to answer it with a sneer. I noticed that while the gentleman from Illinois was delivering that speech he looked not once upon that portrait of Washington yonder, or upon that portrait of La Fayette there. [Applause on the Democratic side.] The central thought of the gentleman's speech was that we must hold these islands forever, because a great contest, either military or commercial, is to come. If, sir, it is to be a military contest, who does not know that those islands present our one source of military weakness? [Applause on the Democratic side.] If it is to be a commercial contest, what then?

Mr. Chairman, I know something of commercial life. I have known men in the commercial world, from the smallest merchant up to those somewhat euphemistically termed "great capitalists of industry," and my observation has been that that merchant, whether great or small, that commercial man, whether large or little, was the most successful, was the most honored in life and in death, who acted upon principles of justice and kept his plighted faith. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Nations are made up of individuals. The type is as the person. And I say now to the gentleman from Illinois that that nation will have the fairest chance in the future contest for commercial supremacy which lives by the principles of justice and acts in the light of superb and splendid ideals. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

But I need not in my poor way attempt to answer the gentleman from Illinois. That speech was answered long before it was ever uttered. It is not necessary to go back through the misty ages that are gone and read the philosophy of the ancients; you need go no further back than the adoption of the Declaration of Independence, wherein it was declared that "all governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed." [Applause on the Democratic side.] The speech of the gentleman from Illinois was answered by every sword ring in the hand of an American soldier in every battle of the American Revolution. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The darkness has not yet fallen. The roll call will begin in a few moments. When it begins and before you vote suppose you gentlemen walk out upon the portico which adorns the south end of this magnificent Capitol building wherein we sit, turn your eyes to the west, and look there upon the massive Washington Monument, its peak tinted now by the evening October sun, builded to the memory of a man who stood for the principle that all governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed, and you will find there an answer to the speech of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN]. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I walked on Sunday last out through beautiful Arlington, under the trees all saturated and shot through with sunshine, looked upon the graves of men who died for their respective countries, and I said to myself, "Why, here is an answer to the speech of the gentleman from Illinois."

Must I go further? In the capital city of the gentleman's own State there is a mausoleum. I have never seen it, but I am told that it is simple and splendid, as befits the memory of the man whose ashes rest within it. Abraham Lincoln was the first great leader of the Republican Party. He anticipated and answered the speech of the present leader of the Republican Party when he said, "No man is good enough to govern another man without that man's consent." [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I wish, sir, that it were possible at this time, in this solemn and sacred hour, to lay aside the prejudices of the past and determine that we shall not "stain the virtuous character of our enterprise" by partisanship or factional differences. We are preparing now to tread the mountain range of human life. I wish you gentlemen on the Republican side might come up out of the murk and the fog and walk with us in the sunlight. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Idealistic, you say? Let us grant that it is even so. I am not ashamed to support the ideals for which my fathers stood.

[Applause on the Democratic side.] We shall do a great thing when we take this step; we shall do a great thing when we maintain in its purity that ideal which has been the guiding star of our own national life. We shall do a great thing, and this shall be a historic day. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. CANTOR. Can we have it reported, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. There are three amendments.

Mr. MILLER. I have offered three amendments.

Mr. JONES. Can we have them reported, Mr. Chairman, in the order in which they were offered?

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the first amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, after the word "stable," in line 4 of the second paragraph, insert the word "representative," so that the line will read, as amended, "to recognize their independence as soon as a stable representative government can be established therein."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, after the word "established," in line 4 of the second paragraph, insert the words "and maintained."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, after the word "therein," in line 4 of the second paragraph, insert the following: "Provided, That the people of the Philippine Islands shall desire their independence expressed by a majority vote of the qualified electors at the general election held next after it shall be decided that a stable government can be established."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MILLER) there were—ayes 33, noes 100.

So the amendment was lost.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG].

The Clerk read as follows:

In the preamble, second paragraph, third line, after the word "islands," insert the following: "ceded to the United States Government by the treaty of peace concluded between the United States and Spain on the 11th day of April, 1899, the boundaries of which are set forth in article 4 of said treaty."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Dakota.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, under the rule I think the committee rises without any motion.

The committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ADAIR, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 18459) to declare the purpose of the people of the United States as to the future political status of the people of the Philippine Islands, and to provide a more autonomous government for those islands, and had directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to with the preamble, and that the bill do pass.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I take it that under the practice laid down in the Manual the question now comes on the preamble. The Manual says in a note:

In the practice of the House of Representatives the preamble of a bill or joint resolution is agreed to most conveniently after the engrossment and before the third reading.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the preamble.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays on that.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 214, nays 62, answered "present" 4, not voting 149, as follows:

YEAS—214.

Abercrombie	Davis	Hensley	Riordan
Adair	Decker	Holland	Rogers
Adamson	Deitrick	Houston	Rothermel
Alken	Dent	Howard	Rouse
Alexander	Dershem	Hughes, Ga.	Rubey
Ashbrook	Dickinson	Hull	Rucker
Aswell	Dies	Humphreys, Miss.	Rupley
Bailey	Diffenderfer	Igoc	Russell
Baker	Dillon	Jacoway	Saunders
Barkley	Dixon	Johnson, Ky.	Shackleford
Barnhart	Donohoe	Johnson, S. C.	Sherley
Bartlett	Donovan	Jones	Sherwood
Barton	Dooley	Keating	Sims
Bathrick	Doollittle	Kennedy, Conn.	Sisson
Beall, Tex.	Doremus	Kettner	Slayden
Bell, Ga.	Doughton	Key, Ohio	Small
Blackmon	Driscoll	Kinkad, N. J.	Smith, Md.
Borchers	Dupré	Kirkpatrick	Smith, Tex.
Borland	Eagan	Lafferty	Stanley
Brockson	Eagle	Lazaro	Stedman
Brodbeck	Edwards	Leshner	Stephens, Miss.
Broussard	Evas	Lever	Stephens, Nebr.
Brown, W. Va.	Falconer	Lieb	Stephens, Tex.
Bruckner	Fergusson	Lobeck	Stout
Brumbaugh	Ferrie	Logue	Taggart
Buchanan, Tex.	Finley	Loneragan	Talcott, N. Y.
Bulkley	FitzHenry	McClellan	Tavener
Burgess	Floyd, Ark.	McGillicuddy	Taylor, Ark.
Burnett	Gallivan	McKellar	Taylor, Colo.
Byrnes, S. C.	Garner	Maguire, Nebr.	Taylor, N. Y.
Byrns, Tenn.	Garrett, Tenn.	Mitchell	Ten Eyck
Candler, Miss.	Garrett, Tex.	Montague	Thomas
Cantor	George	Moon	Thompson, Okla.
Cantrill	Gill	Morgan, La.	Townsend
Caraway	Gillett	Morrison	Tribble
Carew	Gilmore	Moss, Ind.	Underhill
Carlin	Goeke	Murray	Underwood
Carter	Goodwin, Ark.	O'Brien	Vaughan
Cary	Gordon	Oldfield	Vollmer
Casey	Goulden	Padgett	Walker
Chandler, N. Y.	Gray	Page, N. C.	Weaver
Clancy	Griest	Park	Webb
Clark, Fla.	Griffin	Peterson	Whaley
Claypool	Hamill	Pheasant	Whitacre
Cline	Hamlin	Post	White
Coady	Hardwick	Pou	Williams
Connelly, Kans.	Hardy	Quin	Wilson, Fla.
Cooper	Harrison	Raney	Wingo
Cox	Hart	Raker	Witherspoon
Crisp	Hay	Rauch	Young, Tex.
Crosser	Hayden	Rayburn	The Speaker
Cullop	Hedlin	Reilly, Conn.	
Dale	Helm	Reilly, Wis.	
Davenport	Helvering		

NAYS—62.

Ainey	Fess	Kiess, Pa.	Plumley
Avis	Frear	Kinkaid, Nebr.	Scott
Barchfeld	Gardner	Kreider	Sells
Beakes	Good	La Follette	Sloan
Browne, Wis.	Green, Iowa	Langham	Smith, Idaho
Bryan	Greene, Mass.	McGuire, Okla.	Smith, J. M. C.
Butler	Greene, Vt.	McLaughlin	Stafford
Campbell	Hamilton, N. Y.	Mann	Steenerson
Cramton	Hawley	Miller	Sutherland
Curry	Hayes	Mondell	Thomson, Ill.
Danforth	Holgesen	Moore	Towner
Drukker	Hinds	Morgan, Okla.	Vare
Dunn	Humphrey, Wash.	Parker	Volstead
Esch	Johnson, Utah.	Patton, Pa.	Young, N. Dak.
Fairchild	Johnson, Wash.	Payne	
Farr	Kennedy, Iowa	Platt	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—4.

Fields	Hammond	Smith, Saml. W.	Taylor, Ala.
--------	---------	-----------------	--------------

NOT VOTING—149.

Allen	Fowler	Kindel	Neeley, Kans.
Anderson	Francis	Kitchin	Neely, W. Va.
Ansberry	French	Knowland, J. R.	Nelson
Anthony	Gallagher	Konop	Nolan, J. I.
Austin	Gard	Korby	Norton
Baltz	Gerry	Langley	Oglesby
Bartholdt	Gittins	Lee, Ga.	O'Hair
Bell, Cal.	Glass	Lee, Pa.	O'Leary
Bocher	Godwin, N. C.	L'Engle	O'Shaunessy
Bowdie	Goldfogle	Lenroot	Paige, Mass.
Britten	Gorman	Levy	Palmer
Brown, N. Y.	Graham, Ill.	Lewis, Md.	Patten, N. Y.
Browning	Graham, Pa.	Lewis, Pa.	Peters
Buchanan, Ill.	Gregg	Lindbergh	Porter
Burke, Pa.	Gudger	Lindquist	Powers
Burke, S. Dak.	Guernsey	Linthicum	Prouty
Burke, Wis.	Hamilton, Mich.	Loft	Ragsdale
Calder	Harris	McAndrews	Reed
Callaway	Haugen	McKenzie	Roberts, Mass.
Carr	Henry	MacDonald	Roberts, Nev.
Church	Hill	Madden	Sabath
Collier	Hinebaugh	Mahan	Scully
Connolly, Iowa	Hobson	Maher	Seldomridge
Conry	Howell	Manahan	Shreve
Copely	Hoxworth	Mapes	Sinnott
Edmonds	Hughes, W. Va.	Martin	Slomp
Elder	Hulings	Merritt	Smith, Minn.
Estopinal	Kahn	Metz	Smith, N. Y.
Faison	Keister	Morin	Sparkman
Fitzgerald	Kelley, Mich.	Moss, W. Va.	Stephens, Cal.
Flood, Va.	Kelly, Pa.	Mott	Stevens, Minn.
Fordney	Kennedy, R. I.	Mulkey	Stevens, N. H.
Foster	Kent	Murdock	Stringer

Sumners
Switzer
Talbot, Md.
Temple
Thacher

Treadway
Tuttle
Wallin
Walsh
Walters

Watkins
Watson
Willis
Wilson, N. Y.
Winslow

Woodruff
Woods

So the preamble was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:
Until further notice:

Mr. ALLEN with Mr. ANDERSON.
Mr. ANSBERRY with Mr. AUSTIN.
Mr. CARR with Mr. BARTHOLDT.
Mr. COLLIER with Mr. EDMONDS.
Mr. CONNOLLY of Iowa with Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania.
Mr. CONRY with Mr. GUERNSEY.
Mr. ELDER with Mr. HAUGEN.
Mr. ESTOPINAL with Mr. HINEBAUGH.
Mr. FAISON with Mr. HOWELL.
Mr. FITZGERALD with Mr. HULINGS.
Mr. FLOOD of Virginia with Mr. KEISTER.
Mr. FOSTER with Mr. KELLEY of Michigan.
Mr. FOWLER with Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH.
Mr. FRANCIS with Mr. SHREVE.
Mr. REED with Mr. SINNOTT.
Mr. SABATH with Mr. SMITH of Minnesota.
Mr. SELDOMRIDGE with Mr. STEPHENS of California.
Mr. SPARKMAN with Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota.
Mr. SUMNERS with Mr. SWITZER.
Mr. TALBOTT of Maryland with Mr. TREADWAY.
Mr. THACHER with Mr. WALTERS.
Mr. TUTTLE with Mr. WOODRUFF.
Mr. WALSH with Mr. WOODS.
Mr. GALLAGHER with Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island.
Mr. GARD with Mr. LEWIS of Pennsylvania.
Mr. GERRY with Mr. LINDQUIST.
Mr. GLASS with Mr. MCKENZIE.
Mr. GODWIN of North Carolina with Mr. MADDEN.
Mr. GOLDFOGLE with Mr. MAPES.
Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois with Mr. MORIN.
Mr. GUDGER with Mr. MOSS of West Virginia.
Mr. KONOP with Mr. MOTT.
Mr. LEE of Georgia with Mr. NELSON.
Mr. MCANDREWS with Mr. NORTON.
Mr. NEELEY of Kansas with Mr. PORTER.
Mr. NEELY of West Virginia with Mr. POWERS.
Mr. PATTEN of New York with Mr. PROUTY.
Mr. FIELDS with Mr. LANGLEY.
Mr. LEE of Pennsylvania with Mr. ROBERTS of Nevada (commencing Wednesday, October 14, 1914, except on war-tax bill or conference report).

Mr. LEVY with Mr. ANTHONY.
Mr. GORMAN with Mr. FRENCH.
Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois with Mr. CALDER.
Mr. LINTHICUM with Mr. WILLIS.
Mr. O'SHAUNESSY with Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts.
Mr. BURKE of Wisconsin with Mr. BRITTEN.
Mr. CHURCH with Mr. COPLEY.
Mr. LOFT with Mr. J. R. KNOWLAND.
Mr. WATSON with Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan.
Mr. LEWIS of Maryland with Mr. TEMPLE.
Mr. MANAHAN with Mr. GREGG.
Mr. STEVENS of New Hampshire with Mr. PAIGE of Massachusetts.

Mr. WATKINS with Mr. SLEMP.
Mr. BROWN of New York with Mr. MERRITT.
Mr. PALMER with Mr. MARTIN.
Mr. CALLAWAY with Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania.

On the vote:
Mr. BOOHER (for Philippine bill) with Mr. KAHN (against).

For the session:
Mr. SCULLY with Mr. BROWNING.
Mr. HAMMOND with Mr. BURKE of South Dakota.
Mr. METZ with Mr. WALLIN.
Mr. TAYLOR of Alabama with Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia.
Mr. HAMMOND. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire whether the gentleman from South Dakota, Mr. BURKE, voted on this preamble?

The SPEAKER. He did not.
Mr. HAMMOND. Mr. Speaker, I am paired with Mr. BURKE of South Dakota and I voted "aye." I would like to change my vote and answer "present."

The name of Mr. HAMMOND was called, and he answered "Present."

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Chairman, I desire to inquire if my colleague, Mr. LANGLEY, voted on this question?

The SPEAKER. He did not vote.

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, I am paired with my colleague, Mr. LANGLEY. I voted "aye." I desire to withdraw that vote and answer "present."

The name of Mr. FIELDS was called, and he answered "Present."

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call my name.

The name of Mr. CLARK of Missouri was called, and he answered "Aye." [Applause.]

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was read the third time.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Speaker, I move to recommit the bill to the Committee on Insular Affairs, and on that motion I move the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER] moves to recommit the bill, and on that motion he moves the previous question.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Washington rise?

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to offer a motion for a substitute.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman can not do that with the previous question pending.

Mr. BRYAN. I will say to the gentleman from Iowa this is the prohibition amendment, and I hope he will not stand in the way of it.

The SPEAKER. The question can not be debated.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken, and the motion was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 212, nays 60, answered "present" 4, not voting 153, as follows:

YEAS—212.

Abercrombie	Davenport	Helm	Reilly, Wis.
Adair	Davis	Helvering	Riordan
Adamson	Decker	Hensley	Rogers
Aiken	Deltrick	Holland	Rothermel
Alexander	Dent	Houston	Rouse
Ashbrook	Dershem	Howard	Rubey
Aswell	Dickinson	Hughes, Ga.	Rucker
Bailey	Dies	Hull	Rupley
Baker	Difenderfer	Humphreys, Miss.	Russell
Baltz	Dillon	Igoe	Saunders
Barkley	Dixon	Johnson, Ky.	Shackelford
Barnhart	Donohoe	Johnson, S. C.	Sherley
Bartlett	Donovan	Jones	Sherwood
Barton	Dooling	Keating	Sims
Bathrick	Doolittle	Kennedy, Conn.	Sisson
Beall, Tex.	Doremus	Kettner	Slayden
Bell, Ga.	Doughton	Key, Ohio	Small
Blackmon	Driscoll	Kinkaid, N. J.	Smith, Md.
Borchers	Dupré	Kirkpatrick	Smith, Tex.
Borland	Eagan	Kitchin	Sparkman
Brockson	Eagle	Lazaro	Stanley
Brodbeck	Edwards	Leshner	Stedman
Broussard	Evans	Lever	Stephens, Miss.
Brown, W. Va.	Falconer	Lieb	Stephens, Nebr.
Bruckner	Farr	Lloyd	Stephens, Tex.
Brumbaugh	Fergusson	Lobeck	Stone
Buchanan, Tex.	Ferris	Logue	Stout
Bulkeley	Finley	Loneragan	Taggart
Burgess	FitzHenry	McClellan	Talcott, N. Y.
Burnett	Floyd, Ark.	McGillicuddy	Tavener
Byrnes, S. C.	Gallivan	McKellar	Taylor, Ark.
Byrns, Tenn.	Garner	Maguire, Nebr.	Taylor, Colo.
Candler, Miss.	Garrett, Tenn.	Mitchell	Taylor, N. Y.
Cantor	Garrett, Tex.	Montague	Thomas
Cantrill	George	Moon	Thompson, Okla.
Caraway	Gill	Morgan, La.	Thomson, Ill.
Carew	Gillmore	Morrison	Townsend
Carlin	Goeke	Moss, Ind.	Tribble
Carter	Goodwin, Ark.	Murray	Underhill
Cary	Gordon	Neely, W. Va.	Underwood
Casey	Goulden	O'Brien	Vaughan
Chandler, N. Y.	Gray	Oldfield	Vollmer
Clancy	Griest	Padgett	Walker
Clark, Fla.	Griffin	Page, N. C.	Weaver
Claypool	Hamill	Park	Webb
Cline	Hamlin	Peterson	Whaley
Coady	Hardwick	Phelan	Whitacre
Cooper	Hardy	Quin	White
Cox	Harrison	Rainey	Williams
Crisp	Hart	Raker	Wingo
Crosser	Hay	Rauch	Witherspoon
Cullop	Hayden	Rayburn	Young, Tex.
Dale	Hefflin	Reilly, Conn.	The Speaker

NAYS—60.

Ainey	Bryan	Curry	Fairchild
Avis	Butler	Danforth	Fess
Barchfeld	Campbell	Dunn	Fear
Browne, Wis.	Cramton	Esch	Gardner

Gillett	Johnson, Utah	Miller	Sinnott
Good	Johnson, Wash.	Mondell	Sloan
Green, Iowa	Kennedy, Iowa	Moore	Smith, Idaho
Greene, Mass.	Kless, Pa.	Morgan, Okla.	Smith, J. M. C.
Greene, Vt.	Kinkaid, Nebr.	Parker	Stafford
Hamilton, N. Y.	Kreider	Patton, Pa.	Steenerson
Hawley	La Follette	Payne	Sutherland
Hayes	Langham	Platt	Towner
Helgesen	McGuire, Okla.	Plumley	Vare
Hinds	McLaughlin	Scott	Volstead
Humphrey, Wash.	Mann	Sells	Young, N. Dak.

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—4.

Beakes	Fields	Hammond	Smith, Saml. W.
		NOT VOTING—153.	
Allen	Gerry	Levy	Prouty
Anderson	Gittins	Lewis, Md.	Ragsdale
Ansberry	Glass	Lewis, Pa.	Reed
Anthony	Godwin, N. C.	Lindbergh	Roberts, Mass.
Austin	Goldfogle	Lindquist	Roberts, Nev.
Bartholdt	Gorman	Linthicum	Sabath
Bell, Cal.	Graham, Ill.	Loft	Scully
Boeber	Graham, Pa.	McAndrews	Seldomridge
Bowdle	Gregg	McKenzie	Shreve
Britten	Gudger	MacDonald	Slomp
Brown, N. Y.	Guernsey	Madden	Smith, Minn.
Browning	Hamilton, Mich.	Mahan	Smith, N. Y.
Buchanan, Ill.	Harris	Maher	Stephens, Cal.
Burke, Pa.	Haugen	Manahan	Stevens, Minn.
Burke, S. Dak.	Henry	Mapes	Stevens, N. H.
Burke, Wis.	Hill	Martin	Stringer
Calder	Hinebaugh	Merritt	Summers
Callaway	Hobson	Metz	Switzer
Carr	Howell	Morin	Talbott, Md.
Church	Hoxworth	Moss, W. Va.	Taylor, Ala.
Collier	Hughes, W. Va.	Mott	Temple
Connelly, Kans.	Hulings	Mulkey	Ten Eyck
Connelly, Iowa	Jacoway	Murdock	Thacher
Conry	Kahn	Neeley, Kans.	Treadway
Copley	Keister	Nelson	Tuttle
Drukker	Kelley, Mich.	Nolan, J. I.	Wallin
Edmonds	Kelly, Pa.	Norton	Walsh
Elder	Kennedy, R. I.	Oglesby	Waiters
Estopinal	Kent	O'Hair	Watkins
Faison	Kindel	O'Leary	Watson
Fitzgerald	Knowland, J. R.	O'Shaunessy	Willis
Flood, Va.	Konop	Paige, Mass.	Wilson, Fla.
Fordney	Korbly	Palmer	Wilson, N. Y.
Foster	Lafferty	Patten, N. Y.	Winslow
Fowler	Langley	Peters	Woodruff
Francis	Lee, Ga.	Porter	Woods
French	Lee, Pa.	Post	
Gallagher	L'Engle	Pou	
Gard	Lenroot	Powers	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. LEVY (for) with Mr. GERRY (against).

Mr. SCULLY (for) with Mr. BROWNING (against).

Mr. J. I. NOLAN (for) with Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island (against).

Mr. SABATH (for) with Mr. GUERNSEY (against).

Mr. FITZHENRY (for) with Mr. MCKENZIE (against).

Mr. MITCHELL (for) with Mr. MADDEN (against).

Mr. FIELDS (for) with Mr. LANGLEY (against).

Mr. LINTHICUM (for) with Mr. WILLIS (against).

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois (for) with Mr. ANTHONY (against).

Mr. GORMAN (for) with Mr. FRENCH (against).

Mr. DIFENDERFER (for) with Mr. ANTHONY (against).

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland (for) with Mr. TEMPLE (against).

Mr. WATSON (for) with Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan (against).

Mr. WILSON of Florida (for) with Mr. STEPHENS of California (against).

Mr. WALSH (for) with Mr. MOSS of West Virginia (against).

Mr. NEELEY of Kansas (for) with Mr. MERRITT (against).

Until further notice:

Mr. GALLAGHER with Mr. CALDER.

Mr. CALLAWAY with Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota.

Mr. GLASS with Mr. DRUKKER.

Mr. GODWIN of North Carolina with Mr. FORDNEY.

Mr. CONRY with Mr. PETERS.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, is the gentleman from Iowa, Mr. GOOD, recorded?

The SPEAKER. He is not.

Mr. MANN. I will not ask to have him recorded. He answered to his name; but he can correct it himself in the morning.

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, I voted "yea," but I find that I am paired with my colleague, Mr. LANGLEY, and I desire to withdraw my vote and answer "present."

The name of Mr. FIELDS was called, and he answered "Present."

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call my name.

The name of Mr. CLARK of Missouri was called, and he voted "yea," as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The Chair would like to ask the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] if he asked that the gentleman from Iowa, Mr. GOOD, be recorded?

Mr. MANN. I did not; but he voted "nay."

Mr. HAYES. He stood right behind me, and voted "nay."

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman from Illinois asks that it be done, the Chair will have him recorded.

Mr. MANN. Well, he can correct it in the morning without objection, I take it.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

On motion of Mr. JONES, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the preamble was adopted and the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. MULKEY, by unanimous consent, was granted leave of absence for the day, on account of illness.

COTTON WAREHOUSES.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker, in a recent Washington dispatch to a Georgia paper announcing my introduction of a bill to relieve the cotton producers the correspondent added:

The Georgia Congressman has assurances from his colleagues of support which he believes will assure the passage of the bill.

That is a solid, honest paper, with a conscientious management. The sentence added in the dispatch is a pardonable gratuity. The optimistic correspondent, with a good heart, wished to say something pleasant, if not sensational, so he added the cheerful fabrication as to assurance of support and belief in passage. Newspaper statements attributing to Congressmen hope of securing this sort of legislation and reckless statements of politicians not in Congress have resulted in unfortunate misapprehension on the part of the people and aroused in them hope of Federal legislation. Then an effort has been made by the same newspapers and politicians to prejudice the minds of the people by alleging that Congressmen have promised to secure specific Federal legislation with definite results.

The appalling disaster visited upon the South is lamentable enough without being aggravated by the play of cheap politics and unjust charges against Congressmen, producing distrust among the people. The newspapers and politicians do not even specify any particular Congressmen as guilty of making such promises, but with a general sweep of indiscriminate denunciation charge Congress in general with being recreant in failing to provide relief for emergency conditions in the South, as though Congress, forsooth, had promised to do so. Some men assert in the papers that apathy or opposition of some southern Congressmen, without specifying which, is responsible for failure to secure relief.

On their face these statements appear ridiculous. I doubt not that every Member of Congress sympathizes with the South in suffering the irreparable blow which has fallen upon her without her fault and without warning. I believe every Representative here will agree that Members from the Southern States have been earnest and active, in season and out of season, to find some way to meet the demands of the situation. When the universal war began it peremptorily stopped the mills and closed the markets which usually take two-thirds of our cotton crop. No matter how short the war might be it came at a time when the cotton crop was ready to be placed on the market. That crop not only represented the labor of the producers but also all their credit. To supply them credit to produce that crop required all the capacity of the landlords, the supply merchants, and the local banks, and the banks strained their credit in the money centers to supply credit to the merchants and landlords. That crop, with by-products, the day before hostilities began represented considerably more than a billion dollars. The crop is not too large under normal conditions. The world needs every bit of it. On the average the people who produced it have not nor ever had one-third as much cotton goods as they really need.

If normal conditions had permitted them to realize the value of their cotton, the profit of the crops would have enabled them to supply their needs and thereby utilize every bit of the artificial surplus we hear so much about the necessity of retiring. If they were allowed enough profit to enable them to use what cotton goods they need themselves, their own demands would furnish a better market than all the East, and consume one-third of the entire crop. The foreign markets having entirely closed, the domestic mills, never having furnished a market for more than one-third, were unable to meet the emergency and supply a market for the entire crop, and conditions being so uncertain that they did not know what to depend on in the general confusion and calamity, they decided they were afraid to buy at all, so they virtually destroyed the market for the other third, declining to buy cotton except in dribbles as they could consume it. Then, the entire demand being removed and all markets closed, the law of supply and demand was completely suspended, there being a bountiful supply and absolutely no

demand. There was no place to send the cotton, therefore it would be foolish to start to move it. There being no one to receive it, there was no place for it to go. Under such circumstances it was cruel mockery for people to talk of moving the cotton crop, except to move from the cotton field into the cotton house or warehouse. It was obvious that the cotton must be held by somebody, if gathered at all, to wait until the market should be opened. The question was, who should hold it? Should the producer suffer confiscation wholly or in part by parting with it for a trifle, not only forfeiting the profit of his labor, but failing to pay half of his debts, and leaving himself and family without the means to live, without credit for another year, and without the heart to produce another crop if he should unexpectedly be credited with the means? Such conditions render unnecessary the discussion of curtailing the next crop.

The impoverished condition of the toilers will curtail that, for unless some means are found to save them from ruin now they will not be able to produce another crop. If money were advanced to producers on their cotton in moderate amounts, something like as much as they would have to take for it if they sacrificed it, they could use the cotton as collateral, and holding it until conditions improve would reap the benefits of the inevitable advance when the markets reopen. If they are not aided in some way to hold it themselves so as to enjoy the benefit of restored prices, the cotton buyers and speculators will take it on their own terms and hold it until, by reopening of the markets, the price advances to a normal and honest rate, thereby making for themselves great gain. If they were all southerners, and made the deal in their own right the wealth would remain in the South, although the producers would be robbed of the value of their cotton; if the buyers were all Americans trading in their own right people in the United States would still retain all the profit and our balance of trade would be maintained, though the South lost half the value of the cotton, and although the producers were financially ruined and carried down with them the merchants whom they owed, because not realizing on their cotton enough to pay them, and the merchants in turn not being able to discharge their obligations. But, unfortunately, these deals are not all made on American account. When the markets shall be reopened it will be found that most of this cotton bought by the factors at a sacrificial figure has been bought with foreign capital, and when it is shipped abroad the difference between 12 cents and 6 cents paid by the foreigners for our cotton will entirely wipe out the balance of trade and leave us a debtor nation, with the producers of cotton impoverished and helpless, and the southern supply merchants either bankrupt or so crippled as not to be able to help the producers to make another crop.

True, some people deny the extent of the disaster and even question the emergency itself, saying that in previous years the farmers have without ruin sold their cotton for lower prices than now prevail. Such persons forget that prices mean nothing except by comparison. The 5-cent cotton of past years was produced for somewhere about 5 cents; supplies to make the crop and to buy with the crop cost less than half they now cost; the debts contracted were less than half the debts due for producing the present crop. The producers really received more, by comparison with cost and debts, when the price was 5 cents than is possible now. The net result at the present confiscatory prices is on the minus side. The value of money can only be ascertained by what it will buy. Compared with cost of production or the debts of the producers owed therefor, this crop ought to bring 12 or 14 cents, while compared with current prices of cotton goods cotton ought to bring 18 or 20 cents.

With such horrible conditions harrowing our minds, it is not surprising that southern Congressmen were quick to comprehend the gravity of the situation and begin to exercise their wits and work night and day to discover and invoke means to prevent or mitigate impending calamity. The only thing more surprising than that is that the aforesaid newspapers and politicians were either too careless to discover or too reckless to acknowledge that the southern Congressmen, although not all agreeing as to method to secure relief, were feeling, talking, and acting just as I have described, bent on thrashing out the question and finding and applying relief if possible.

We knew, and the aforesaid newspapers and politicians knew, that the southern Members constituted but a small minority in the House and also a minority in the Senate. But we Members from the South had faith in the patriotism and liberality of our colleagues of the other sections. While the prospect of success was not bright, the situation was so desperate that we continued to work, hoping that light might break on the situation and that mayhap we might fall upon a plan which would commend itself to Congress and the administration. Some few

of our colleagues, inconsiderately, we think, declined to support any of our plans and denounced as dishonest demagogues zealous Congressmen who, with whatever degree of hope, small or great, were earnestly striving to find some safe road to relief. But we began to hold meetings innumerable in the Senate Building, in the House Building, in committee rooms, in the Treasury, and at the White House. The farmers came here and pictured their desperate condition. We met with them and heard them repeat their true and terrible tale of woe, horrible now, and more terrible in prospect, to the President, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Reserve Board, all of whom heard with interest and sympathy, but declared they must act in this matter with their heads, not with their hearts. It may not be necessary, however, simply because they failed to give us encouragement, for us to conclude that their heads are weaker than their hearts. Numerous bills have been introduced, but no one of them has had the unanimous approval of even the southern Congressmen up to this time, neither has a single one of them met with the unanimous approval of the critics in the newspapers, political and otherwise, nor have all of them agreed on any practical suggestions which they could advise Congress to put through, although denouncing Congress for not acting and accusing Congressmen of violated promises to act.

In fact, long before any person outside of Congress suggested the possibility of Federal interference to avert disaster we had promptly taken up the subject. Although the exchange system was broken up, we thought if commodities could move from where they are to where they are not, and therefore needed worse, gold could also be transported in compensation, and we knew wherever gold could pass the possibility would soon be followed by a representative or substitute. All ships of belligerents having withdrawn from the traffic, we, believing that neutral ships could carry our supplies to all the ports of the Old World, promptly provided for a sufficient number of ships under the American flag to carry all of our products to Europe. The war-risk insurance being too great for private companies to handle, we provided for the Government to insure cargoes on all ships flying the American flag. While these measures will rapidly afford relief, it can not be done rapidly enough to save from ruin the producers of the cotton. It is impossible to meet and curb the exact difficulties of the case under our present system of finance. If the banks were disposed to vary their custom, which is not probable, and carry the cotton on loans to the farmers, who are not their direct customers, instead of the commercial people, who are their regular customers and need all the money they can get, and always get it, to buy the cotton while it is cheap—even then they would be unable to take care of the entire situation. So we were compelled to recognize that unless the Government, either through the banks or directly to the producers, advanced money, disaster could not be averted.

The bill referred to in the outset of my remarks reads as follows:

A bill (H. R. 19113) to enable owners of cotton produced by them or on their land to borrow money by depositing as security warehouse receipts issued for the period of the loan.

Be it enacted, etc., That any solvent national bank or State bank which shall, within 60 days from and after the passage of this act, lend to the owner of any cotton produced by himself or on his land by his cropper or tenant not more than three-fourths of the market value of said cotton at the time and place of the transaction, taking the borrower's note therefor, secured by the deposit of warehouse receipts for such cotton, with an insurance policy covering the value of the cotton for the period of the loan such note to mature one year after date and bear interest at the legal rate in the State in which the loan is made, may at any time before the maturity of such note deposit the note, cotton receipts, and insurance policy with the Treasury or any subtreasury of the United States and be refunded, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the amount of the money loaned: *Provided*, That when such note is finally paid the said bank shall receive as compensation for its services one-third of the interest collected, and the said bank shall indorse on such note and collateral its warranty that the papers are genuine and that the loan did not exceed three-fourths of the market price at the time and place of the loan. Beyond that the bank shall be held for no further liability, except to render the Treasury such assistance as may be called for in collecting and remitting when the note matures.

I never did tell anybody I could pass it, nor did I try to deceive anybody about it. I introduced it for the consideration of my colleagues. Nor did I even ask anybody to put it in a newspaper. I wrote it with a view of obviating objections urged against our plan in our conferences. The Secretary of the Treasury and the President had satisfied me that however good their disposition they were unable to afford adequate relief without legislation. They had opposed issuing bonds, and expressly to avoid issuing bonds had recommended the war revenue bill. Many Congressmen had objected to a deposit of hundreds of millions of dollars, while others object to an additional note issue without increasing the gold reserve.

All the local business interests, including the banks, objected to unsettling business by lowering the rates of interest on loans made in the various States. And it seems to me that almost everybody objected to the valorization plan. If it were fixed too high, the Government would have to take it all; if fixed too low, it would result in holding down the price. So I conceived a plan of enabling the banks to do the business on certain specified conditions:

First. For a limited period of time lend to producers only.

Second. Observe the legal rate of interest at the place of the transaction.

Third. My bill would render necessary no sale of bonds nor issue of additional currency. If it were passed, we would find there was sufficient money afloat to meet all the demands, and that is a great advantage of my bill which does not seem to have been recognized by my colleagues. The truth is that when the system is started whereby money will be loaned on distress cotton the effect would be magical; confidence of the producers would be restored and the purchasers would recover from their panic, the price would rise, sales would occur, and the money loaned would be paid out on debts and returned to the bank and loaned on other cotton—so a much smaller amount would be required in the end than our people in their distress seem now to deem necessary.

Fourth. That they lend not exceeding three-fourths of the market value at the time and place of the transaction. Lending with regard to market value does not arbitrarily fix prices; but when it is known that three-fourths of the price can be borrowed on a bale of cotton many of the producers will refuse to sell, but prefer to borrow a portion of the price and hold their cotton for better prices. The effect would be that the purchasers would begin to compete for cotton and the price would advance. It would certainly never go any lower when it was known that the Government was prepared to lend to the producers so as to save them the necessity of selling at a sacrifice. The loan for 12 months would give the borrower a chance, and he could sell his cotton if the price advanced and pay off the loan before it was due. The banker making the loan could at any time before maturity of the note send his paper to the Treasury and be refunded his advance. It is analogous to the regional-bank system, and is the regular and natural way of doing business. The member bank carries his note with commercial collaterals to the regional bank and, less the discount, is refunded the money advanced. Under my bill the bank would use the Treasury instead of the regional bank. Under the regional-bank system the member bank would indorse the note; under my bill he would indorse the note only as far as necessary. The cotton ticket, being the best security in the world when the cotton is insured against loss, needs no further indorsement to make it the best gilt-edge security in the world than the guaranty that the deal is genuine and bona fide. But, in the face of a great crisis already upon us, I do not care to stickle for a particular bill.

I went into conference with the other representatives of the cotton States, and we agreed upon a bill, and I am bound by it—I always stand hitched. No man can win alone; only by united action can we hope to succeed. The revised Henry bill is entirely constitutional; there is nothing revolutionary about it; there is nothing unusual about it except the amount of money involved. The Government has in many instances before extended aid in cases no more meritorious, but smaller amounts were furnished. But, even if our scheme is a large one and the proposition unusual, Members should recollect that this is not an ordinary occasion; there is the greatest emergency upon us that has fallen upon the South, and through the South the entire country, except the Civil War, in the history of our Republic. Words can not exaggerate the existing suffering and the danger of greater calamity in the immediate future. When the producers are stricken down, all the superstructure of our system trembles if it does not fall. Members should abate some of their squeamishness in the face of this great disaster. There can be no danger to the Treasury, and Members are unnecessarily alarmed about the soundness of money and the credit of the country. If this Government never goes bankrupt until it does so by protecting the cotton producers, it will live to flourish for ages to come. The rock of its salvation financially is to take care of them.

There is so much paper money resting on so small a gold reserve nobody need "tear passion to tatters" about this proposition. The necessity and wisdom of a proper ratio of gold reserve to the paper money I do not care to discuss, but men are going a long way out of the sane and orderly path when they lie awake at night questioning the validity of any money now issued or hereafter ever to be issued by authority of the United States. There is another matter I wish to call attention

to—the demand of the commercial side of the issue, curtailment of the next cotton crop—and some people responding to that demand have insisted that Congress by a prohibitive tax prevent overproduction of cotton next year.

I have always advocated and practiced that farmers should first provide for their own household by planting supply crops and raising live stock and devoting the remainder of their land and labor to raising cotton as a surplus crop, but I have never believed that it would operate permanently to reduce the crop. Intensive farming has satisfied us that our farmers could make just as much cotton on half the land they now plant and leave some margin of labor, fertilizer, and other expense to devote to supply crops. Our people during the Confederacy needed supplies, but they did not need cotton, as they could neither spin nor export it, and it might fall into the hands of the enemy and enable them to fight us more fiercely. If the Confederacy could have turned a large cotton crop into gold, they would have been glad to do so; but by legislation they curtailed the acreage so that the armies and the people could be supported and that the people would not waste time cultivating cotton for the enemy to capture.

At this time the farmers have not asked us for advice nor for the imposition of further burdens of taxation. If they wish to curtail the cotton acreage, they will find a way to do so. The State legislatures can do so, if they wish, under their police powers.

The cotton growers have asked us to provide money to take care of the distress cotton of this crop, not to manage their future business for them. Those who urge the excise tax to limit the production of cotton cite what they call several precedents. All are agreed that we may levy such a tax for the purpose of raising revenue, and the Constitution authorizes that only, but they say Congress imposed a tax on cotton once. That is true, but it was really for the purpose of raising revenue, but it was never sustained by a full bench, and was repealed because it was so odious. They further cite the tax on notes of State banks and oleomargarine. Those are unfortunate citations, and they are both abominable outrages, and I would rather repeal them than to commit another outrage. The first was passed to put State banks out of business and help the national-bank monopoly; the second was passed to put oleomargarine out of business and raise the price of dairy products.

As I understand the attitude of the courts, they leave Congress to say what the character of a bill is. If Congress deliberately promulgates a bill declared to be a revenue bill, the courts will take it for granted that Congress is telling the truth about it and hold it constitutional without interrogating the tax collectors as to the revenue produced or cross-examining Congressmen as to the integrity of their purpose in enacting it as a revenue bill. But if Congress should pass a bill levying a prohibitive tax on cotton with the purpose declared in the law that it was not to raise revenue and not expected to raise revenue, but to prevent the overproduction of cotton, no lawyer would contend that the Supreme Court would sustain such a bill as constitutional.

The proposition up to us now is to try to fool our consciences, fool the Supreme Court, and fool the people under the guise of a revenue bill by levying such a high tax on cotton that it would reduce production and raise no revenue. The majority in the Congresses which passed the oleomargarine law and the tax on State banks may or may not have known what the truth was, but it is certain they did not tell the truth, and the Supreme Court has never passed on the facts, but accepted the two acts as bona fide revenue measures. In this case, when we know that the purpose of a tax on cotton would not be for revenue, but to prevent overproduction, knowing that the Constitution prevents our voting for a tax bill not intended for revenue, we could hardly be expected to vote for such a bill. The newspapers and politicians who have criticized us are not even united in demanding that. In fact, many of them admit that it is not competent for us to vote.

In a recent meeting of the governors of the cotton States here, several of the governors agreed with us, my own among the number, and my own governor favored curtailing the acreage, but not by Federal taxation. He favored the Henry bill, with proviso that borrowers should contract to reduce acreage. Very few of the Members of the House and Senate at this time would agree that under the Constitution they could honestly vote for such a tax bill. A few of them so believe, and I believe they are as honest as I am; they are just mistaken in their discrimination. They are as anxious to afford relief as I am, and this reference is not made to criticize them at all, but to set right before the country the true issue in that respect.

There is one thing that all Members representing the cotton States have practically united on, and we have tried now, and

often before, to secure action on it—that is, the repeal or suspension of tax on State banks. If the State banks were free to issue their currency this crisis could have been easily met and disaster averted. That tax ought to be repealed regardless of other action in this crisis, but I appeal to all to sink all rigid notions of policy and eschew differences and criminations and recriminations. The bill agreed on in our conference of representatives of the cotton States has more support than any other proposition brought in; it would bring immediate relief if passed. It can be made to apply the remedy immediately to the disease with instant effect. It is constitutional; it is rational; it is practical; it is the only thing the farmers have demanded, and I appeal to you, my colleagues, that we support that bill, and failing to pass that, then try some other. I for one decline to vote for adjournment or consent to a recess until we shall have either secured relief legislation or, by a fair opportunity to present the case and secure a vote on it, been finally and fairly defeated in our efforts. The cause is just, and I insist on consideration in this House.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. THOMPSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on a subject of interest to my people in Oklahoma.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD on some subject which will interest the people of Oklahoma. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. RUPLEY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to secure unanimous consent for the purpose of extending in the RECORD some comment upon the principles of the Progressive Party.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RUPLEY] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject of the principles of the Progressive Party. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 9 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Thursday, October 15, 1914, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATION.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, a letter from the Secretary of Agriculture asking Congress for authority and funds to initiate the work of exterminating the pink boll worm of cotton that has made its appearance in Florida (H. Doc. 1175) was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Agriculture, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

By Mr. HAY, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 241) for the appointment of four members of the Board of Managers of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1190), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BEALL of Texas, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the resolution (H. Res. 446) directing the Committee on the Judiciary to inquire and report whether the action of this House is necessary concerning the alleged official misconduct of Daniel Thew Wright, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1191), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Invalid Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 19092) granting a pension to Frank Stires, and the same was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HARDWICK: A bill (H. R. 19281) to provide for the issue and sale of the Panama Canal bonds and for the deposit of

their proceeds in certain banks; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CARTER: A bill (H. R. 19282) for the relief of the cotton situation in certain Southern States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19283) authorizing a per capita payment to Choctaws and Chickasaws; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. LEVER: A bill (H. R. 19284) to appropriate \$15,000, to be expended by the Secretary of Agriculture, for preventing the spread of the pink boll worm, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HAY: Resolution (H. Res. 646) to provide for the consideration of House joint resolution 241; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CARY: Resolution (H. Res. 647) requesting the President and the Secretary of the Navy to inform the House on certain matters; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey: Resolution (H. Res. 648) to pay John J. Cameron \$500 for extra services during the first and second sessions of the Sixty-third Congress; to the Committee on Accounts.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAIR: A bill (H. R. 19285) granting an increase of pension to John T. Harnish; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CLANCY: A bill (H. R. 19286) granting a pension to David F. Boddie; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19287) granting an increase of pension to Jane Amanda Putnam; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CAMPBELL: A bill (H. R. 19288) granting an increase of pension to Junius R. Clift; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19289) granting an increase of pension to Martin Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KEY of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 19290) granting a pension to Levi B. Roseberry; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LIEB: A bill (H. R. 19291) granting an increase of pension to Dixon Pennington; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19292) granting an increase of pension to Jeremiah W. Pickering; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LONERGAN: A bill (H. R. 19293) granting an increase of pension to Ida E. Thorman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RUSSELL: A bill (H. R. 19294) granting an increase of pension to Deltrick Bruns; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: A bill (H. R. 19295) granting an increase of pension to George S. Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAVENNER: A bill (H. R. 19296) for the relief of John R. McClain; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19297) granting a pension to Sarah L. Moredock; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. VOLSTEAD: A bill (H. R. 19298) granting a pension to Rose Barnes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. BAILEY: Petition of William B. Klahre, of Johnstown, Pa., protesting against tax on motion-picture theaters; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of the Twentieth Century Manufacturing Co., of Boynton, Pa.; the Moxham Lumber Co., the Penn Traffic Co., and R. G. Morgart, all of Johnstown, Pa., protesting against tax on automobiles and auto factories; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRUCKNER: Petitions of D. K. Webster, B. Wilkins, George Altgoever, P. Mesiani, J. Ellner, F. Delucia, Abr. Ackerman, Joseph Altman, E. Gordesio, S. Berkowitz, J. Jannis, William Hammer, S. Aronsontom, G. Max Wornon, A. Allison, James Wilson, W. S. Gennis, H. Goldfarb, and V. Gayda, all of New York, N. Y., against tax on drugs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARY: Petition of the Daniel R. Jones Co., of Milwaukee Wis., against tax on proprietary medicines; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COOPER: Petition of the board of directors of the Milwaukee (Wis.) Chamber of Commerce, protesting against a

tax on sales of grain, etc., when made in exchanges; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CURRY: Petition of 15 business firms of Vallejo, Cal., in favor of House bill 13305, the Stevens standard-price bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DALE: Petition of G. W. Blass, of Port Byron, N. Y., and Neeskin Co. and J. L. Hopkins & Co., of New York City, protesting against tax on patent medicines; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRIFFIN: Petitions of G. Morillo and others, retail druggists of New York City, protesting against tax on patent medicines; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HINEBAUGH: Petitions of F. C. Judevine, of Bellwood, and others, together with petitions from Gresham, Cordova, Beaver Crossing, Abie, Morse Bluff, Adams, Linwood, Prague, Malmo, Utica, Waco, Germantown, Goehner, Crete, Thayer, Seward, Surprise, Osceola, Rising City, David City, Shelby, and Brainard, all in the State of Nebraska, in favor of House bill 5308, to compel concerns selling goods direct to consumers entirely by mail to contribute their portion of funds in the development of the local community, the county, and the State; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HULINGS: Petitions of J. C. Koch, of St. Marys; A. M. Lowentritt, of Oil City; and H. M. Silman, of St. Marys, all in the State of Pennsylvania, protesting against the proposed taxation of automobiles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of John C. Owsley, secretary and treasurer of the Sharon Retail Drug Association, of Sharon; G. G. Curry, of Greenville; Ross Drug Co., of Ridgway; John M. Siegfried, of Warren; W. A. Talbot, secretary and treasurer of the Piso Co.; C. Kembel & Son, of Tidioute; and J. W. Agrellus, of Youngsville, all in the State of Pennsylvania, protesting against the proposed taxation of proprietary medicines and other drugs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: Petitions of sundry citizens of western Washington, protesting against war tax on patent medicines; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KINDEL: Petition of 21 citizens of Westminster, Colo., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LIEB: Petitions of William H. Fogas, Charles Dawson, and D. & R. Rosenbaum, all of Mount Vernon, Ind., protesting against tax on patent medicines; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PLUMLEY: Resolutions of Branch No. 1, Local Barre of the Socialist Party of Vermont, in regard to the increase of the cost of living, and praying that the Government take over railroads, mills, mines, stores, and warehouses for the benefit of all people, and protesting against a tax on the necessities of life; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Bayden Grange, of Westminster, Vt., favoring acquisition of the telephone service by the Government; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. REED: Petitions of the Nashua Auto Club, of Nashua; W. C. Spear, of Manchester; and H. C. Lintott, of Nashua, all in the State of New Hampshire, against proposed Government tax based on horsepower of motor cars; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILLIAMS: Petitions of the First Presbyterian Church and Sunday School and sundry citizens of Palmyra, Ill., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, October 15, 1914.

(Legislative day of Thursday, October 8, 1914.)

The Senate reassembled at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

THE COTTON SITUATION IN THE SOUTH.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. President, I present a telegram, in the nature of a memorial, from the Texas State Senate, which I ask to have read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Secretary will read.

The Secretary read as follows:

AUSTIN, TEX., October 14, 1914.

HON. CHARLES A. CULBERSON,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

The following simple resolution, by Senators Henderson and Gibson, was to-day adopted by the Senate of Texas:

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of Texas, That we hereby endorse the amendment as proposed by the southern Senators and offered as an amendment to war-tax bill, wherein it is proposed that the National Government issue \$250,000,000 of 4 per cent three-year bonds, and that said bonds shall be used to purchase 5,000,000 bales of this year's cotton at 10 cents per pound, and providing that said cotton